

For Reference

NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

For Reference

NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

Ex LIBRIS
UNIVERSITATIS
ALBERTAENSIS





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2019 with funding from
University of Alberta Libraries

<https://archive.org/details/DRBishop1969>

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE:

A CONCEPTUAL DEVELOPMENT

by



DONALD R. BISHOP

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

OF MASTER OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

FACULTY OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION AND COMMERCE

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

FALL, 1969

Shaw
1959/5/1
22

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies for acceptance, a thesis entitled Organizational Change: A Conceptual Development submitted by Donald R. Bishop in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Business Administration.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to express his sincere appreciation to the supervisor of the thesis, Dr. E. S. Shihadeh, for his guidance and advice, particularly in view of the patient and understanding manner with which it was offered.

In addition, the writer also wishes to express his gratitude to other members of the Faculty of Business Administration and Commerce, in particular Professor D. J. Hickson, for their comments and suggestions which proved invaluable in the preparation of this thesis.

Finally, a particular expression of gratitude and thanks is due the writer's wife for her continuing support and encouragement, without which this thesis could not have been possible.

ABSTRACT

This study examines those concepts or theories which have formed an integral part of the conceptual development of contemporary thinking concerning the nature and process of organizational change.

A review of concepts of change as suggested by early evolutionary, analytical, and functional approaches is presented to establish a theoretical base for an appreciation of more recent sociological considerations pertaining to the analysis of social change. Conceptual considerations of contemporary sociology, primarily in terms of analytical and functional analysis, are then examined to complete the theoretical foundation from which contemporary approaches to the analysis of organizational change are derived.

A survey of organization theory literature is then made to permit the presentation of contemporary conceptual thinking pertaining to the analysis and implementation of organizational change.

Finally, this conceptual development is utilized to delineate two dominant themes of organization theory literature as it deals with organizational change, and it is also used to suggest relevant concepts or theories that could be employed as research topics in studies designed to further understanding of the nature and process of organizational change.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I	NATURE OF THE STUDY	1
	Purpose of the Study	
	Approach of the Study	
	Scope and Limitations of the Study	
	Overview of the Topic Area	
	Organization of the Study	
II	THE THEORETICAL BASIS OF THE CONCEPT OF SOCIAL CHANGE: AN EVOLUTIONARY PERSPECTIVE	11
	Introduction	
	The Evolving Concept of Social Change	
	The Evolutionists and Their Theoretical Contributions	
	Summary	
	The Emergence of Early Analytical and Functional Thinking	
	Summary	
	Conclusions	
III	CONTEMPORARY ANALYTICAL AND FUNCTIONAL SOCIOLOGICAL APPROACHES TO THE ANALYSIS OF SOCIAL CHANGE	48
	Introduction	
	Contemporary Analytical and Functional Approaches	
	Summary	
IV	OTHER CONTEMPORARY SOCIOLOGICAL CONCEPTUALIZATIONS OF PROCESSES OF SOCIAL CHANGE	82
	Introduction	
	The Conceptual Framework	
	Social Disorganization and Conflict	
	Innovation	
	Accumulation and Cultural Lag	
	Termination	
	Summary	
	Conclusions Regarding Contemporary Approaches to Social Change	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
V	ORGANIZATIONAL DESIGN AND CHANGE: CONTEMPORARY APPROACHES	104
	Introduction	
	Structural Approaches	
	Technological Approaches	
	Actor Approaches	
	The Systems Perspective	
	Summary and Conclusions	
VI	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	158
	Summary of Concepts of Planned Change	
	Summary of the Organizational Design Concept	
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	181

CHAPTER I

NATURE OF THE STUDY

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to carry out an examination of the nature and process of organizational change in order to delineate those concepts which have application in relation to that organizational design which copes most efficiently with change. A secondary purpose of this study is to utilize this conceptually developed organizational design and recently advocated concepts regarding the planning and implementation of change in order to suggest appropriate concepts or theories that would be empirically useful in research studies related to the problem of organizational change.

Approach of the Study

These aims of the study, as outlined above, will be accomplished in the following manner:

1. A conceptual examination of the major theories as advanced by early evolutionary, analytical, and functional theorists who concentrated

on the examination of the concept of social change. This will show that these early contributions to theoretical literature have laid the foundation for contemporary sociological approaches to the analysis of the process of social change.

2. A consideration of contemporary sociological approaches to the problem of social change, primarily in terms of contemporary analytical and functional approaches that in turn have provided a conceptual framework for the analysis of change in the organizational setting.

3. Finally, a conceptual examination of contemporary organizational approaches to the problem of change, primarily in terms of structural, technological, actor, and systems approaches. An inquiry will also be made into recent organizational literature which is directed toward the planning and implementation of change.

Scope and Limitations of the Study

The literature dealing with the concept of change, whether from sociological, philosophical, or organizational sources, constitutes a vast and comprehensive review of the nature of man and society as dominated by a continually changing environment. This study, however, is limited to those sociological and organizational concepts which

have played a significant part in the development of contemporary conceptualizations of organization change in terms of that organizational design which deals most effectively with change, and those applicable research topics which have been emphasized.

Although the study is primarily concerned with the development of the concept of organizational change in terms of the design perspective, it has a secondary purpose of providing the reader with a relatively comprehensive review of what the literature actually presents in terms of social and organizational change. Therefore, in addition to presenting the organizational design concept of organizational change and the development thereof, this study will attempt to place conceptualizations of social and organizational change, especially in terms of planned change, within the overall perspective.

Overview of The Topic Area

The analysis and understanding of social change, and more recently, organizational change, has formed a significant aspect of sociological and organizational theory from the inception of sociological thought.¹

¹ This emphasis in sociological theory is noted by S. N. Eisenstadt, ed., Comparative Perspectives on Social Change (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1968), p. xi, Amitai and Eva Etzioni, eds., Social Change, Sources, Patterns, and Consequences (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1964), p. 3, Richard T. LaPiere, Social Change (New York: McGraw Hill, 1957), pp. 8, 37, and Nicholas S. Timasheff, Sociological Theory, Its Nature and Growth, (New York: Random House, 1957), p. 55.

Traditional sociological considerations of social change tended to emphasize the nature of change as subject to universal laws which propelled societies toward some ultimate utopian ideal, and because of this tendency their approach to change has been termed evolutionary.² In spite of the fact that their approach has been generally accepted as untenable, they did provide the foundation of contemporary approaches through their delineation of early systems perspectives suggesting the interdependent nature of aspects of society as operating in an interactive nature in the change process.³ In addition, they provided the foundation

In addition, the prominence of organizational change in organizational theory literature, leads one prominent organizational theorist, Warren G. Bennis, Changing Organizations: Essays on the Development and Evolution of Human Organizations (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1966), p. 41, to suggest that recent work in the area of organizational behavior is "virtually a catalogue of the problems of organizational change."

2 This delineation of the early sociological approaches to social change in evolutionary terms is a common category in sociological histories. See, for example, LaPiere, Social Change, pp. 4-6, or Timasheff, Sociological Theory, p. 55.

3 This foundation of contemporary analytical and functional approaches to the analysis of social change is evident in Talcott Parsons, The Structure of Social Action, (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1949), wherein Parsons examines the conceptual views of Weber, Durkheim, Pareto, as they provided the foundation of his own general systems theory. In addition, Timasheff, Sociological Theory, pp. 221, 234, noted the importance of this early work as it provided the foundation of contemporary approaches.

of the functional approach to the analysis of change through their delineation of certain factors of change, such as technology, demographic, and religious, as these factors operated for change in relation to structures of society, especially institutional aspects.⁴

Contemporary sociological considerations of change have added to this basis or foundation of the concept of organization design in terms of the systems perspectives by emphasizing analytical, functional, and certain other approaches to the analysis of social change.

For example, the analytical approach to change, in its emphasis on the construction of unified sociological theory which acts as the framework for the analysis of sociological phenomena, including change, has further developed the systems perspective which holds change to be the continuous result of internal and external change stimuli, as of an interactive and interdependent nature, and as of a dialectic nature.⁵ This analytical perspective, in some cases

⁴ This is suggested by Timasheff, Sociological Theory, pp. 55-56.

⁵ One of the better examples of contemporary sociological analytical perspectives is in Talcott Parsons, The Social System (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1951), wherein Parsons outlines his general systems theory.

through the use of models, has provided conceptual schemes for the analysis of change in terms of differentiation, equilibrium stability, and other aspects.

The functional approach of contemporary sociology, although accepting the nature of change as an interactive process, has tended to concentrate on the analysis of change in terms of particular processes that relate to specified sociological units.⁶ As a result of this concentration, they have served to illustrate and reiterate the importance of social conflict, strain, or tension as an instigator of change, and they have delineated the concept of functions, and the obverse, dysfunctions, as they contribute to or detract from the efficiency of a given social system in terms of its adaptability to change.⁷

Additional sociological approaches to social change, those who have chosen to term themselves neither analytical or functional, have tended to concentrate on general aspects of change as applicable

6 The best example of, and explanation of, the functional approach is that of Merton's in Robert K. Merton, Social Theory, And Social Structure (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1949). See also Marion J. Levy Jr., The Structure of Society (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1952), which is also devoted to a discussion of the functional approach in sociological analysis.

7 See, for example, Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure, pp. 115-123.

in different social levels and different social spheres.⁸ In this manner they have served to illustrate that concepts such as innovation, disorganization, and termination, as they relate to social change, must be considered within the organizational design concept as they relate to the adaptability of that design to change.

Contemporary considerations of organizational change, although tending to concentrate on the applied aspect of change, especially through the actor approach, have utilized the contributions of sociological theory in an attempt to suggest that since the primary problem facing organizations would appear to be adaptation to continual change, therefore organizations must be so designed or structured to attain maximum adaptability.⁹

In attempting to achieve the most efficient organizational design, in terms of adaptability, organizational theorists have adopted the systems perspective and its emphasis on the interactive nature of change, and the structural-functional approach and its emphasis on particular change processes as they relate to particular organizational aspects.¹⁰

8 This is suggested by Etzioni and Etzioni, eds., Social Change, p. 403.

9 This theme is particularly evident in the work of Bennis, Changing Organizations, and J. D. Thompson, Organizations In Action (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967).

10 This is suggested by Bennis, Changing Organizations, p. 39,

Through the use of structural-functional analysis within the systems perspective, and the utilization of sociological considerations of change such as conflict, innovation, adaptation, change factors, functional behavior, and the concept of efficiency, organizational theorists have evolved the concept of organizational design in terms of maximum adaptability, or efficiency.

In addition, these theorists have evolved certain specific concepts such as functional behavior, control, communication, power, uncertainty, role, motivation, leadership and decision-making, and suggested how these concepts could be applied in order to contribute to optimal organizational efficiency.¹¹

This brief overview of the topic area has illustrated the objective of this study, and the evolution of the contemporary approach to organizational change in terms of organization design.

and by P. Selznick, "Foundations of the Theory of Organizations", Administrative Science Quarterly, 1, (1956), 63-85.

¹¹ The development of these concepts as they apply within the open systems context represents the work of a number of authors. See particularly Bennis, Changing Organizations, P. M. Blau and W. R. Scott, Formal Organizations: A Comparative Approach (San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Co., 1962), D. Katz and R. L. Kahn, The Social Psychology of Organizations (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966), H. J. Leavitt, Managerial Psychology: An Introduction to Individuals, Pairs, and Groups In Organizations (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958), J. A. Litterer, Organizations: Structure and Behavior (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1963), J. G. March and H. A. Simon, Organizations

Organization of the Study

This introductory chapter has stated the purpose and scope of the study to be undertaken, and has presented a brief overview of the topic area. Chapter II presents the theoretical basis of the concept of social change through a discussion of the evolutionary approach to social change. This evolutionary perspective provides the conceptual foundation for Chapter III in terms of early analytical and functional approaches to social change. This latter chapter is then directed towards the examination of contemporary analytical and functional sociological approaches to the analysis of social change, in order to note the importance of these approaches as they are evident in contemporary organizational theory as it treats with organizational change. In order to complete the review of contemporary sociological considerations of change, Chapter IV presents other sociological approaches to change, primarily in terms of innovation, diffusion, and termination, to illustrate some conceptual approaches to possible processes of change which are evident in contemporary organization design approaches to change.

Chapter V is devoted to the discussion of the primary organizational theory approaches to change, in terms of structural, technological, actor, and systems perspectives, and it also notes the contemporary emphasis of organizational literature on the concept of

(New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958), A. S. Tannenbaum, Control In Organizations (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1968), and Thompson, Organizations in Action.

planning or implementing change. Finally, Chapter VI presents a summary of the two primary themes of organizational literature dealing with change, those of planned change and organizational design as such a design can be utilized in enhancing organizational effectiveness in coping with change. In addition, this chapter suggests certain research topics that would be useful in empirical analysis of concepts or theories that are employed in both major themes.

CHAPTER II

THE THEORETICAL BASIS OF THE CONCEPT OF SOCIAL CHANGE:

AN EVOLUTIONARY PERSPECTIVE

Introduction

Social change has formed a central foci of social thought since the inception of sociology in the mid nineteenth century.¹ This phenomena was also a primary topic in philosophical thought and discussion from the time of the Grecian Philosophers until approximately the nineteenth century when much of the philosophical consideration of the changing nature of man and society merged with the emerging sociological thinking in relation

¹ The concept of social change in early sociological thought has been suggested by several authors. See, for example: S. N. Eisenstadt, ed., Comparative Perspectives on Social Change (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1968), p. xi; Amitai Etzioni and Eva Etzioni, eds., Social Change: Sources, Patterns and Consequences (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1964), p. 3; Richard T. LaPiere, Social Change (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1957), pp. 8, 37; and Nicholas S. Timasheff, Sociological Theory: Its Nature and Growth (New York: Random House, 1957), p. 55.

to the phenomena of change.²

The purpose of this chapter is then as follows:

1 To reveal historical insights in the evolving concept of social change, and to outline significant theoretical contributions of these early writers to contemporary thinking in the process of social change.

2 To review early analytical and functional thinking.

Generally speaking, sociological thinking in the area of social change has gradually evolved from the early evolutionists who attempted to discover universal laws governing the progress of society to the more contemporary approach in which sociologists are attempting primarily a

2 Some discussions of the early Grecian and subsequent philosophical thinking concerning social change include, among others, Harry Elmer Barnes, Historical Sociology: Its Origins and Development (New York: The Philosophical Library, 1948) pp. 7-15; Elmer S. Borgardus, The Development of Social Thought (4th ed., New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1960), pp. 108-149; Eisenstadt, Comparative Perspectives on Social Change, pp. xii-xv; Floyd Nelson House, The Development of Sociology, (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1936), pp. 11-58; LaPiere, Social Change, pp. 2-4. The merging of philosophical thought and sociological views of social change is well exemplified in the work of Karl Marx, as discussed in Howard Selsam and Harry Martel, eds., Reader In Marxist Philosophy (New York: International Publishers Inc., 1963), parts one and two, where the philosophical concept of materialism and its application in Marxism becomes a factor in social change in terms of the need of the working class to control the means of production or of materialistic aspects.

situational analysis of change without concentration on the discovery of universal laws.³

The classification of major historical thinking in the area of social change into several broad categories serves to identify major themes and trends in the emerging concept of that phenomena. Although there are several classifications available in sociological literature,⁴ two broad themes will form a starting point for our discussion: those

3 One of the foremost proponents of this situational or functional approach is Merton who emphasizes the need for "Middle-range" theories in opposition to "Grand" theories in Robert K. Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1949) pp. 4-10. Other sociologists who have referred to the contemporary situational approach of sociology are: Delbert C. Miller, "Theories of Social Change" in Technology and Social Change, ed. by Allen et al, (New York: Appleton Century Crofts, Inc., 1957), pp. 101-102; Timasheff, Sociological Theory, pp. 307-308; and Pitrim Sorokin, Contemporary Sociological Theories (New York: Harper and Bros., 1928), pp. 757-760.

4 A number of sociological classifications were developed in such references as Timasheff, Sociological Theory, pp. ix-xiii; or Sorokin, Contemporary Sociological Theories, pp. xx-xxi, both of whom utilize broad categories such as mechanical, geographical, biological, etcetera, that include the phenomena of social change. Some authors, such as Lapiere, Social Change, pp. 4-33; or Don Martindale, Social Life and Cultural Change (Princeton, N.J.: D. Van Nostrand Co. Inc., 1962), pp. 5-12, tend to be overly detailed in the method of classification, particularly in the case of Lapiere who uses eighteen classifications, or they tend to emphasize aspects of the development of social change, as in the case of Martindale, who emphasizes concepts of change from philosophical viewpoints i.e. as progressive versus non-progressive.

authors who sought historical laws governing the evolution of society, namely the evolutionists, and those who were concerned with an analytical or functional approach to social change, namely the predecessors of contemporary analytical or functional sociologists.⁵

The Evolving Concept of Social Change

The Evolutionists and Their Theoretical Contributions

Early sociological thinking was primarily devoted to the rationalization of the existing order and the view that man's existence was inherently wretched and that he was doomed to accept the social structure as it existed.⁶ About the end of the seventeenth century change in a society came to be viewed as a continuous process which allowed for the development of mankind, and not one where man must accept the social order as it exists, thereby living a life doomed to wretchedness.⁷

5 Timasheff, Sociological Theory, p. 12 discusses the growth of sociological theory in terms of the pioneers, evolutionism, the foundations of contemporary sociological theory in analytical and functional contributions, and contemporary views.

6 Lapiere, Social Change, pp. 2-4; and Martindale, Social Life and Cultural Change, pp. 5-6, both suggest that the major support for this concept came from the vested interests of the Middle Ages, primarily the medieval church.

7 The emergence of this view of continuous change is discussed by several authors, among them: Barnes, Historical Sociology, pp. 16-35; House, The Development of Sociology, pp. 3-5; LaPiere, Social Change, p. 3; and Timasheff, Sociological Theory, p. 12.

Hence the beginning of the evolutionary concept of mankind emerged, namely as one progressing towards some type of a utopian civilization. Auguste Comte and Herbert Spencer, for instance, both accepted the concept of continuous cultural and social change.⁸

The former viewed sociology as consisting of statics, which involves the study of the structure of society, and of dynamics, which is the study of the continuous change occurring in society.⁹ Comte's significant contribution was in expressing the theme of the early thinkers in social change that since development in all societies was governed by the same universal laws, then the task of sociologists was one of utilizing the historical approach in the study of existing advanced societies in order to determine these laws.¹⁰

8 The views of these authors is discussed in: Auguste Comte, System of Positive Polity, Vols. I-IV, translated by John Henry Bridges (New York: Burt Franklin, 1875); and Herbert Spencer, First Principles (1862). However, as Timasheff, Sociological Theory, p. 55, notes, they adopted different perspectives in that Comte suggested mankind can influence his own evolution, whereas Spencer suggested that mankind was subject to laws which he could not influence.

9 This division of sociology, suggested by Comte, System of Positive Polity, Vol 1, pp. 505 is discussed by several authors, including McQuilken de Grange, "The Method of Auguste Comte" in Methods In Social Science, A Case Book, ed. by Stuart A. Rice (Chicago, 1931); Timasheff, Sociological Theory, p. 22, and Sorokin, Contemporary Sociological Theories, p. 12.

10 The suggestion of the centrality of this theme in the work of Comte and other evolutionists is noted by Timasheff, Sociological Theory, p. 55, and Sorokin, Contemporary Sociological Theories, pp. 3-62.

For instance, Comte argued that all societies progress on a linear basis through three major stages, which he terms theological, metaphysical, and positive, or scientific.¹¹

The theological stage, for instance, is where man tends to seek explanations of behavior in terms of theology, or tends to ascribe occurrences within the society to external spiritual forces. Gradually this theological stage fused into the metaphysical stage wherein man attempted to discover causes of observable phenomena through the process of reason. Comte viewed the final stage in the development of society as the positive or scientific in which man abandoned his attempts to discover the universal laws through the process of reason and concentrated on the discovery of relationships between phenomena.¹²

¹¹ The most important of Comte's views on social dynamics is included in his System of Positive Polity, Vol. II. This Vol. is devoted to social dynamics, and the law of three stages is introduced in detail in Vol. II p. 24. See also Vol. I, p. 505, and Vol. IV, pp. 555-558, 572-573, and 590.

¹² Comte, System of Positive Polity, Vol. IV, pp. 547-548, there are several discussions of these laws, among them, LaPiere, Social Change, p. 5; Miller, Theories of Social Change, pp. 95-96; and Timasheff, Sociological Theory, pp. 26-27.

Comte's law of the three stages incorporates a successive-stage view of the process of social change in society, wherein the purposeful action of man results in a gradual change of a society from the theological to the scientific, or utopian level of development of that society.¹³ Comte conceived of the fundamental factor of the development of society in terms of the intellect of man which stimulates material progress and results in changes within society.¹⁴

The British author Herbert Spencer viewed the development of society in a different manner than Comte in that whereas Comte believed man's intellect could influence progress, Spencer conceived of the evolutionary doctrine wherein man was considered as analogous to an organism in that man himself could not affect evolutionary progress.¹⁵

13 This view is emphasized by Lapiere, Social Change, p. 5, and Miller, "Theories of Social Change", p. 95.

14 Comte, The System of Positive Polity, Vol. IV, pp. 142-152. The fundamental aspect of this factor in Comte's concept is also emphasized by Timasheff, Sociological Theory, pp. 25-26.

15 Herbert Spencer, Principles of Sociology (New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1910), Vol. 1, pp. 3, 463-470. This basic theme of Spencer's was elaborated on in Spencer, First Principles, (1862); and The Study of Sociology (1873).

In support of this view, Spencer suggested that the basis of sociology as a science was the recognition of the fact that change, through development of a society, progressed through the same stages of growth as those of an organism, and as both organisms and societies grow in size the complexity of their structure increases, which in turn requires progressive differentiation of functions within structures.¹⁶

According to Spencer, evolutionary development in relation to increasing complexity refers to the growth of society through formation of groups in ever increasing size until functionalization results.¹⁷ This importance of the differentiation resulting from group formation is present in contemporary sociological consideration of social change, especially that of Talcott Parsons who advances a functional theory of change in terms of differentiation, although Parsons goes much further

16 Spencer, Principles of Sociology, p. 3.

17 The Spencerian approach to the evolution of man has been discussed by several authors, among which the following are included: Etzioni and Etzioni, eds., Social Change, pp. 3, 10-14; Barnes, Historical Sociology, pp. 25-28; Timasheff, Sociological Theory, pp. 30-42; and Sorokin, Contemporary Sociological Theories, pp. 214-218. The predominance of the organismic analogy in sociological consideration of social change in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries is of such magnitude that any text purporting to cover the development of sociological thought should contain some reference thereto.

than Spencer by discussing the process of change within the system concept.¹⁸

Spencer also refers to an additional type of evolution to that of increasing complexity, that of the transitory type of evolution which is characterized by the transition from a militaristic society dominated by compulsory cooperation to an industrial society which emphasizes voluntary cooperation.¹⁹

Although the concept of organismic analogy in the evolution of society as espoused by Spencer has been discarded by contemporary sociologists, the importance of Spencer's concept lay in its dominance of sociological thought for a few decades in the early nineteenth century, and also in the fact that in the dismissal of this view sociology was able to terminate a basically unacceptable concept and cease devoting time to analogies of man and organisms.²⁰

18 The approach of Parsons to the study of social change in terms of differentiation is in: Talcott Parsons, "A Functional Theory of Change", in Social Change ed. by Etzioni and Etzioni, pp. 83-97. It must be noted that Parsons does not suggest differentiation as the only change process within the social system, and indeed he suggests that other change processes remain to be outlined. For further discussion of the systems concept and change as a process thereto, see: Marion J. Levy, The Structure of Society (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1952).

19 This transitory evolutionary concept of Spencer's is noted by Timasheff, Sociological Theory, p. 38. This concept is also present in contemporary analysis of changing societies, see particularly: William J. Siffin, ed., Toward The Comparative Study of Public Administration (Bloomington, Ind: Indiana U. Press, 1959), p. 100.

20 The rejection of this concept in terms of the dissimilar nature of man and society as compared with organisms is noted by several

The way was then opened for a study of the changing nature of man and society in terms of their existence as unique entities not comparable to organisms, or for the examination of the phenomena of social change as a sociological phenomena, not as a biological one.²¹

Another of the early evolutionists, Karl Marx, contributed to the evolving concept of social change by formulating a single factor theory of change couched in terms of economic materialism.²²

This particular concept of economic materialism reappears in modern concepts of the dynamic social system, especially in Parsons' adaptive sector of his conceptualization of the social system,²³ and it

sociologists, such as: Etzioni and Etzioni, eds., Social Change, p. 6; Timasheff, Sociological Theory, p. 96; and Sorokin, Contemporary Sociological Theories, p. 218.

21 The adherence of early sociology to the biological aspect as comparable to the evolution of man is referred to by Timasheff, Sociological Theory, p. 96, as a "blind alley" preventing fruitful examination of social phenomena, and Sorokin, Contemporary Sociological Theories, p. 218 suggests biological views have no place in the emerging science of sociology.

22 This basic tenant of Marxian philosophy forms the major theme of Marx's most important work, Capital, originally published in 1867. This view of economic materialism is prevalent in much of Marxian literature, see for example his Theories of Surplus Value, or Value, Price, and Profit. A summarized group of articles and letters explaining this view is available in Selsam and Martel, eds., Reader In Marxist Philosophy, pp. 182-223.

23 Parson's concept of the social system will be examined in greater detail in Chapter 3. For a summarized discussion of Parson's concept of the adaptive sector in relation to the means of production see, Max Black, ed., The Social Theories of Talcott Parsons, (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1961), pp. 56-57.

is also an important aspect of Tannenbaum's concept of control in organizations, although Tannenbaum considers control in a different aspect than Marx.²⁴

Marx defined the term economics primarily in terms of the technological means of production and suggested that the means of production determines the social organization of the society, and furthermore, the economic system resulting from the means of production affects all other forms of social processes, including that of change.²⁵ The Marxian view of social change is then one that holds that all societies by dialectical necessity must pass through the process of change wherein the entrenched economic system of production forms an obstacle to the development of innovation, therefore the entrenched system must be overcome through social revolution instigated by the social class representing the new or innovative system.²⁶

24 Tannenbaum utilizes the control technique in the power-equalization approach, a concept that is examined in Chapter IV, in Arnold S. Tannenbaum, Control In Organizations (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1968), pp. 166-184.

25 This aspect of Marxian thought is emphasized in: LaPiere, Social Change, pp. 11-12, and Miller, "Theories of Social Change," pp. 79-81.

26 This is the theme of Marx and Engels, The Communist Manifesto, (1847), and see also Marx, Critique of Political Economics pp. 11-13. For a discussion of this process, see Talcott Parsons, The Social System (New York: The Free Press, 1951), pp. 525-535.

This Marxian concept of adaptation of the society to innovation in terms of technology illustrates a change process that is often referred to by later authors, some of the more prominent being: Bennis, Tarde, and Thompson.²⁷

The apparent fallacy of the Marxian concept of social change lay in two primary areas: firstly, his view that social revolution would occur in industrially advanced nations, and secondly, his concept of the economic factor is generalized to the point where it is not capable of empirical validation.²⁸ In addition, his view of the ultimate in the communist state where the workers would control all means of production has been shown, especially by Parsons, to be incorrect in that communism results in a totalitarian form of society, a concept completely in disagreement with Marxian views.²⁹ Thus, the Marxian concept of the

27 This concept of change in terms of innovation-adaptation is discussed by Bennis, Changing Organizations (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966), pp. 23, 135, and 203; Gabriel Tarde, The Laws of Immitation, trans. by Elsie Parsons, (New York: Holt and Co., 1903), Chapters one and two; and J. D. Thompson, "Innovation In Organizations: Notes Toward A Theory" in Approaches to Organizational Design, ed. by J. D. Thompson (Pittsburg: Pittsburg University Press, 1966), pp. 193-218. This concept will be developed extensively in later chapters.

28 These two basic fallacies of Marxian thought are suggested in Amatai Etzioni and Eva Etzioni, eds., Social Change: Sources Patterns, and Consequences, (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1964), p. 8. For criticisms of Marxian concepts from a sociological viewpoint which emphasizes the inability to validate such a theory, see: Timasheff, Sociological Theory, p. 48; and, Sorokin, Contemporary Sociological Theories, p. 543.

29 Parsons, The Social System, pp. 525-535.

innovative order seizing power and gradually adapting to the ultimate communistic state would not appear to be a viable concept.

However, as Timasheff notes, the adoption of Marxian philosophy as a political ideology in various countries of the world and its appeal to the working class has made this Marxian concept of the process of social change probably the most widely accepted single factor theory of social change, as exemplified by its application in Russia, China, and many other countries.³⁰

Ludwig Gumplowicz, influenced by the work of Charles Darwin's concept of the biological law of evolution, viewed social evolution as completely the product of the struggle between social groups, and suggested that intergroup conflict is the result of a lack of blood bond, coupled with insurmountable hatred, which he believed existed among different races.³¹ In developing this concept of intergroup struggle, he postulated that the economic factor, in terms of the desire for better economic conditions on the part of a group, led to conflict or war which resulted in the subjugation of some other group within the framework of that state or society, this subjugation in turn causing further intergroup struggle.³²

30 Timasheff, Sociological Theory, p. 48

31 The influence of Darwin's concept on Gumplowicz is noted by Barnes, Historical Sociology, p. 16; Timasheff, Sociological Theory, p. 59, and Sorokin, Contemporary Sociological Theories, p. 247. The theme of intergroup conflict is developed in Ludwig Gumplowicz, The Outline of Sociology, trans. by Frederick W. Moore (Philadelphia: American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1899).

32 A summarized version of Gumplowicz's concepts are available

These views led Gumplowicz to suggest that there could never be a unitarily complete association of mankind because of the continual struggle, therefore he suggested that the sum total of history reveals neither progress or retrogression, although those societies most fitted for survival did progress for short periods until they were overthrown.³³

This Darwinistic view of social conflict as advanced by Gumplowicz remains an important concept as one of the causes of social change, as attested to by the recent work of Dahrendorf, Coser, and Leavitt, to mention only a few.³⁴

In addition, Timasheff suggests that Gumplowicz's concept of different societies progressing at different rates is significant in that it was one of the first to recognize that all societies do not progress at the same rate, and also in that it illustrated that the evolutionary view of mankind as constantly changing toward some utopian goal was not necessarily valid.³⁵

in Timasheff, Sociological Theory, pp. 61-63; or, Sorokin, Contemporary Sociological Theories, pp. 481-487.

33 This theme forms the basis of Gumplowicz, The Outline of Sociology, Part V.

34 Ralph Dahrendorf, "Toward a Theory of Social Conflict," in Etzioni and Etzioni, eds., Social Change, pp. 98-111; Lewis A. Coser, "Social Conflict and the Theory of Social Change" in Scott G. McNall, ed., The Sociological Perspective (Boston, Little, Brown and Co., 1968) pp. 283-293; and Harold J. Leavitt, Managerial Psychology (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958), pp. 49-64. The contemporary consideration of the concept of social conflict as it relates to social change will be examined in Chapter III and IV.

35 Timasheff, Sociological Theory, p. 71.

William Sumner, an American Sociologist who was also heavily influenced by the Darwinistic view, viewed society as an interactive system of forces, the complete totality of which is subject to universal social laws, and therefore he conceived of the approach to the study of man in terms of discovering these universal laws so that man could follow them.³⁶ In explaining his concept of evolution as the basic law, Sumner suggested that the habits, or customs of groups are derived by society through a trial and error method wherein the society gradually evolved the best methods of acting in accordance with the views of that society and the conditions in existence, resulting in "folkways", or accepted ways of acting in that society.³⁷

Sumner suggested that as these folkways became more commonly accepted and enforced by the society they gradually evolved into mores, and ultimately, institutions, wherein the customs and habits evolved by a society carry sanctions for non conformance.³⁸ Indeed, these

36 This Darwinistic concept of Sumner's is outlined in his major work, William Sumner, Folkways: A Study of the Sociological Importance of Usages, Manners, Customs, Mores, and Morals (Boston: Ginn and Co., 1906). For a summarized discussion of the sociological importance of Sumner's views, see either Timasheff, Sociological Theory, pp. 66-70; or, Sorokin, Contemporary Sociological Theories, p. 355.

37 Sumner, Folkways, pp. 1-4. See also Temasheff, Sociological Theory, p. 67 for a discussion of these concepts.

38 Sumner, Folkways, pp. 30, 34-36.

concepts appeared to have formed an important part of the theoretical thinking of Talcott Parsons in his pattern maintenance and integrative functions, and the individual's attempts at a reconciliation of the various norms, folkways, and habits in differing and changing social systems.³⁹

A slightly different view of the nature of the evolutionary process was pursued by a number of sociologists, primarily American, who adopted a psychological approach in that they suggested that human mentality and the actions of individuals should be utilized in shaping the nature of human evolution for the betterment of mankind.⁴⁰

For example, the American, Lester F. Ward, conceived of the evolutionary process of man as directed by two basic forces, which he termed genesis and telesis.⁴¹ Ward suggested that genesis referred to the multitude of blind, unknown forces which were a partial cause of evolution, whereas telesis referred to the purposeful action of man as

³⁹ See, for example, Talcott Parsons, Structure and Process in Modern Societies. (New York: The Free Press, 1960), pp. 45-46, and Parsons, The Social System, pp. 505-520.

⁴⁰ The development of this particular aspect of the evolutionary theme is discussed by: Barnes, Historical Sociology, pp. 28-49; Timasheff, Sociological Theory, p. 72; and, Sorokin, Contemporary Sociological Theories, p. 600.

⁴¹ This theme is covered in Lester F. Ward, Dynamic Sociology, 2 Vols., (New York: D. Appleton, 1883). In addition, this theme is evident in later works of his, such as: Psychic Factors of Civilization (1893); Outlines of Sociology (1893); Pure Sociology (1903); and, Applied Sociology (1906).

it was deliberately intended to influence the evolutionary process.⁴² This concept of telesis, or the purposeful action of man in making decisions for his own betterment is a forerunner of more contemporary views of the nature of man primarily in terms of rational behavior, although contemporary authors recognize the irrationality of man in certain aspects, this latter concept being partially similar to Ward's concept of genesis.⁴³

Another American Sociologist, Franklin Giddings, espoused a concept of society as a psychic phenomena resulting from the interaction of certain social laws as limited by certain psychical processes, this constant interaction in turn producing constant change.⁴⁴ This concept led Giddings to suggest a law of social change in which a community will continually exercise a wise choice, based on social values, which will result in that community's evolution toward its own ideal concept of itself.⁴⁵ For example, Giddings utilized this concept

⁴² This aspect of Ward's thought is emphasized by Timasheff, Sociological Theory, pp. 76-79; and, Sorokin, Contemporary Sociological Theories, pp. 640-642.

⁴³ This concept of rationability vs. irrationality will be examined in Chapter 4. For an illustration of contemporary organizational approaches, see March and Simon, Organizations, pp. 203-210.

⁴⁴ Franklin H. Giddings, The Principles of Sociology: An Analysis of Phenomena of Association and of Social Organization (3rd ed., New York: McMillan and Co., 1911).

⁴⁵ Giddings, Principles of Sociology.

of rational choice on the part of the community to suggest that it would gradually evolve through four major stages, ultimately arriving at the final stage of utopia wherein great civically minded societies are produced.⁴⁶

Summary

In summing up historical insights into the evolving and modern concept of social change, the following insights appear to be the most significant:

1 Comte's delineation of the dynamic and static aspects of sociology, and his suggestion of factors of change such as man's intellect, division of labor, and political considerations remains the basis of contemporary multifactor approaches to the study of change.

2 Karl Marx and his delineation of the economic factor resulting in class struggle emphasized the concept of social conflict as it acts as an inducement of change, a concept that remains an integral part of contemporary functional studies of the change process.

3 Gumplowicz's view of social conflict as of primacy in the evolution of man as a basic cause of change appears to have remained valid.

4 The work of Sumner, which emphasized the importance of values, norms, and institutionalized aspects of society as they tend to inhibit the change process paved the way for more contemporary

⁴⁶ This concept of Giddings is noted in Temasheff, Sociological Theory, pp. 84-86.

approaches examining resistance to change.

5 The work of Ward and Giddings served to emphasize that although individuals and communities attempt to exercise rational choice of the best directions of change, in fact the irrationality of human behavior must be considered in the change process.

In addition, the early efforts of these authors provided the partial basis of later approaches to change in their suggestions of the interrelationship of different aspects of society in the change process, a concept that was further developed by the early analytical and functional sociological approaches to, and analysis of, social change.

The Emergence of Early Analytical And Functional Thinking

While theories and thinking of early sociologists were speculative and broadly conceived, they provided, as mentioned earlier, a basis for a closer look into the behavioral components of social systems, for example in such areas as social conflict, rationality and irrationality, and change factors such as technological, economic, and social aspects.⁴⁷ It was left, however, for the early analytical and functional approaches to the study of social change to lay the basis for a broad theoretical approach to a scientific analysis of social change in terms of the interdependence and interrelationship of the

⁴⁷ For a discussion of the contributions of the early sociologists as they provided the foundation for later developments, see Timasheff, Sociological Theory, pp. 12, 106.

parts of a social system.⁴⁸

For instance, Emile Durkheim's views on the interaction of the individual and society are based on his conceptualization of society as a type of collective consciousness defined as the total of beliefs, norms, and sentiments held by the individuals of that society, and furthermore, that each individual possessed two consciences: one, the collective beliefs of the society, and the other, the individual's peculiar attitudes, beliefs, and dispositions.⁴⁹ Durkheim's dichotomy is utilized to exemplify the ways in which social interactions with society significantly influence and change individual attitudes, ideas, and sentiments. In addition, it implies that eventually the collective conscience of society is in turn affected and changed by individuals in groups reacting with the society.⁵⁰

48 The emergence and development of these approaches is discussed in Timasheff, Sociological Theory, p. 97.

49 Emile Durkheim, De la division du travail social, (1893), and Les regles de la method sociologique, (1897). Due to the influence of Durkheim's concepts in modern society, there is a great deal of secondary literature discussing his views. See, for example, Harry Alpert, Emile Durheim and His Sociology (New York: Russel and Russell, Inc., 1961), pp. 174-203; or, Talcott Parsons, The Structure of Social Action (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1937), pp. 301-470.

50 This suggestion as to the importance of the dichotomy of Durkheim's is made in Timasheff, Sociological Theory, p. 117.

Durkheim went on to explain that the continuous division of labor resulting from the increasing complexity of society causes increasing interdependence of individuals in society, and as this occurs, the individual tends more toward the exercise of his individual conscience.⁵¹ He utilizes the term "organic solidarity" to refer to the decrease of the influence of the collective conscience and the increase of individuality in taste, beliefs, opinions and morals.⁵²

Thus he suggested that major change occurs in two stages, firstly little division of labor, characterized by the exercise of the collective conscience, and secondly, extensive division of labor, characterized by individuality.⁵³ In addition, as Parson suggests,

51 A summarized discussion of Durkheim's view of the division of labor is available in either Timasheff, Sociological Theory, pp. 106-118, or Sorokin, Contemporary Sociological Theories, pp. 467-480.

52 This theme, originally expressed in Emile Durkheim, The Division of Labor in Society, 1st. ed. 1893, trans. by George Simpson, (New York: McMillian, 1937) is discussed in LaPiere, Social Change, p. 8.

53 This concept of Durkheim's and its discussion in terms of the two stages is provided in LaPiere, Social Change, p. 8.

Durkheim's concept of the change in society included the aspect of directional orientation of change, especially in terms of the tendency of the individual towards value orientation in relation to that society of which he is a member.⁵⁴

As Timasheff points out, Durkheim probably came the closest of the early analytical sociologists to developing a sociological theory that remains relevant to the present day, even though much of Durkheim's work cannot be validated in the empirical tradition of modern sociology.⁵⁵

Another of the early analytical sociologists, Ferdinand Toennies, emphasized the concept that all social relations are creations of human will, and he conceived of this human will as of two types, the essential will, which is basic and instinctive, and the deliberative will, which is the thoughtful, purposeful exercise of human intellect.⁵⁶

Toennies believed that essential will prevailed in the lives of common people, while deliberative will characterized the activities of scientists, businessmen, and others occupying relatively higher positions in society.⁵⁷ He used these two types of will, respectively

54 Parsons, The Social System, pp. 496-498. This concept of directional orientation will be examined in greater depth in Chapter 3.

55 Timasheff, Sociological Theory, p. 127.

56 This theme is expressed in Ferdinand Toennies, Fundamental Concepts of Sociology, 1st ed. 1887, trans. by Charles P. Loomis (East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University Press, 1957) pp. 103-170.

57. Toennies, Fundamental Concepts of Sociology, pp. 158-159

referred to as Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft, to illustrate the two genetic stages of the development of society wherein man progressed from the common or peasant society to the deliberate rationalistic society as exemplified in the modern industrial state.⁵⁸ The latter stage, or Gesellschaft, is characterized by the exercise of reason by individuals and by the conscious effort of individuals to organize in societies as this type of organization will result in the greatest mutual benefit.

The contribution of Toennies is in his attempt to advance a hypothesis designed to put in order the observed facts of social change, i.e., development from common to industrial societies, in the form of a dichotomy based on a typology of social groups,⁵⁹ a concept that remains present in much of the contemporary literature dealing with modernization.⁶⁰

58 For a summarized discussion of these concepts originally expressed in Toennies, Fundamentals of Sociology, pp. 237-259, see: Miller, "Theories of Social Change," p. 84; Timasheff, Sociological Theory, pp. 97-99; or, Sorokin, Contemporary Sociological Theories, pp. 491-493.

59 These suggestions of the contribution of Toennies are made by LaPiere, Social Change, pp. 7-8; and Timasheff, Sociological Theory, p. 99.

60 See, for example, S. N. Eisenstadt, ed., Comparative Perspectives on Social Change (Boston, Little, Brown and Co., 1968), Section three, for a discussion of modernization, a discussion that appears to be based on Toennies' broad concept.

The German Sociologist George Simmel discarded the approach that there were universal laws governing human development and suggested that certain laws of change did exist, as exemplified in the forms of social organization, leading him to suggest that sociology should be the study of society in terms of the reciprocal relationships of its human elements.⁶¹ Simmel suggested that only through studying the central concept of the forms of society, ie., that relatively patterned and stable element of society such as social stratification, could sociology proceed to the elaboration of social laws specifying sociological processes such as that of change.

The real importance of Simmel's work is in relation to his methodology, or his view that sociology must first examine the form of society in order to delineate processes, although some of his own work on the subject of change in small groups and social conflict remain partially valid.⁶²

The sociology of Gabriel Tarde utilizes as the central theme a process he termed imitation wherein he suggested that since all social phenomena can ultimately be reduced to the association of two individuals,

61 As the complete works of Simmel have not yet been translated, it is necessary to refer to discussions of his work such as: N.J. Spykman, The Social Theory of George Simmel (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1925); or Sorokin, Contemporary Sociological Theories, pp. 500-502.

62 This suggestion is made by Miller, "Theories of Social Change," p. 92, and Timasheff, Sociological Theory, p. 102, where Simmel's emphasis on the study of the form of society and his discussion of conflict arising from diverse motivation is discussed.

innovative activity on the part of one results in imitation by the other.⁶³

Tarde conceived of the process whereby inventions are socially adopted as occurring in three main sub-processes, repetition, opposition, and adaptation, and he suggested that these three sub-processes constitute the domain of scientific inquiry.⁶⁴ This concept of Tarde's, especially in reference to the method whereby an invention or innovation causes change in the social system through the adaptation thereto, remains a primary concept in contemporary sociology, as attested to in the work of Bennis and Parsons.⁶⁵

The central concept of one of the most important contributors in this area, Charles H. Cooley, is that of his organic theory which considers society as a complex of processes, each of which grows through interaction with the other, and in which the complete society is considered so unified that a change in one process affects all other forms and processes.⁶⁶ Cooley discussed extensively the role of the primary group

63 This particular theme was suggested in Gabriel Tarde, The Laws of Imitation, trans. by Elsie Parsons (New York: Holt and Co. 1903), particularly chapters one and two. The concept of innovation will be examined in depth in Chapters 3 and 4.

64 Tarde, The Laws of Imitation, pp. 1-33. For comments on this concept, see: LaPiere, Social Change, p. 32; Timasheff, Sociological Theory, pp. 102-105; or Sorokin, Contemporary Sociological Theories, pp. 636-640.

65 Bennis, Changing Organizations, pp. 23, 125, 203; and Parsons, The Social System, pp. 510-533. The formulation of the concepts of these authors from concepts of earlier authors is developed in Chapters 3 and 4.

66 Charles H. Cooley, Social Organization: A Study of the Larger Mind (New York: Charles Scribner and Sons, 1927), pp. 3-22.

in the growth and formation of individual personality as providing for the individual the basic values and attitudes underlying social solidarity, and he also referred to the role of institutions in the control and direction of the individual, and their role in fulfilling individual needs.⁶⁷

Although Cooley is noted primarily for his concept of the primary group,⁶⁸ his organic theory depicting society as a number of interrelated parts is a forerunner of more contemporary systems approaches which recognize social change as the result of the interaction of many elements.⁶⁹ In addition, his concept of the role of institutions in the control of individual behavior parallels Sumner's views on the nature of institutionalized control, these views providing valuable insights into the broad area of resistance to change.

Another American Sociologist, William I. Thomas, was first concerned with discovering universal laws governing sociological phenomena, but as a result of his use of the analytical approach through field

67 Cooley, Social Organization, pp. 23-50.

68 Some comments on not only Cooley's concept of the primary group but also on his organic theory are provided by: Timasheff, Sociological Theory, pp. 141-147; or, Sorokin, Contemporary Sociological Theories, p. 447.

69 This interdependence of elements forms the basis of the Parsonian concept of the social system, outlined in Parsons, The Social System.

experiments, of which his publication The Polish Peasant⁷⁰ is an example, he ultimately adopted the approach of attempting to ascertain specific consequences to specific antecedents as illustrated in his suggestion as to the study of change in terms of what individual changes in behavior result from specific changes in a situation.⁷¹ This later approach led him to consider social change as being different in different societies, this difference being attributable to varying life experiences of different societies and to their varying interpretations of these experiences in that there was no proponent determination of change in all societies, each society reacted to its own stimulus to change, whether as creative individuals or other factors.⁷²

In addition to reiterating the theme of the interdependence of personality and culture, and emphasizing the importance of following the scientific method in sociological study, Thomas developed two concepts

70 William I. Thomas and F. Zaniecky, The Polish Peasant In Europe and America, 5 Vols., (1918-1921).

71 Thomas' most important works have been collected in Edmund H. Volkhart, ed., Social Behavior and Personality (1951) wherein this theme is referred to on p. 296.

72 The explanation of Thomas' later approach is contained in Timasheff, Sociological Theory, pp. 148-155.

directly related to social change, those of social disintegration and . . . social integration.⁷³ He referred to social disintegration as the disturbance of the equilibrium of society by some event, which may be a crisis in the form of change, and he suggested that if the equilibrium is drastically imbalanced, disorganization results because social values are no longer applicable, and he further suggested that only if new values are constructed can disorganization be replaced by stable equilibrium. Thomas' view of the nature of integration is exemplified in The Polish Peasant,⁷⁴ where he demonstrated that integration or assimilation of peasant cultures into an industrialized society causes resistance because of different attitudes and values.

It is interesting to note that Thomas, probably under the influence of his wife, a statistician, introduced the concept of probabilities instead of laws, because he felt that the total social situation is so complicated that interrelations cannot be measured absolutely.⁷⁵

73 These concepts, which are covered in Volkhart, ed., Social Behavior and Personality, are discussed extensively in Timasheff, Sociological Theory, pp. 147-157.

74 Thomas and Zaniecky, The Polish Peasant.

75 This suggestion is made by Timasheff, Sociological Theory, p. 148. For a discussion of the scientific approach advocated by Thomas, as related to mathematical analysis, see: H. Blumer, Critique of Research In The Social Sciences, (1939), Vol. 1.

The concepts of this author that are basically still valid in relation to social change are those in relation to the interdependence of the individual and society, social disorganization, and the problem of integration, and his suggestion that different change processes occur in different societies.⁷⁶

Vilfredo Pareto, an Italian Sociologist, viewed society as a system of interdependent parts each of which is maintained in equilibrium with the other parts, and he suggested that each society has within itself forces which either tended to maintain the equilibrium or which tended to cause change.⁷⁷ He believed that the state of society is determined by three main conditions, the extrahuman element, other elements exterior to the society, and the inner elements of the society itself which he termed interests, knowledge, residues, and derivations.⁷⁸ This particular view, although couched in different terms, is utilized extensively in contemporary systems approaches to change which view the

76 The suggestion as to the validity of these concepts is made in Timasheff, Sociological Theory, p. 156.

77 Pareto's scheme of equilibrium was developed in a comprehensive manner, utilizing extensive historical examples, and detailed mathematical analysis. This concept forms the basis of Vilfredo Pareto, The Mind and Society, ed. by Arthur Livingstone and trans. by Bongiorno and Livingstone (London: Johnathan Cope Ltd., 1935), Vol. IV.

78 Pareto, The Mind and Society, Vol. IV, pp. 1433. Much of the other volumes of this work discuss the determinants of society.

inner forces of society as reacting to the external environment, although not necessarily in the state of equilibrium that Pareto refers to.⁷⁹

Social change is discussed by Pareto in terms of his theory of the circulation of elites wherein he suggests that if the governing elite is dominated by the entrepreneurial spirit, change will be rapid, but that if it is dominated by the conservative elite, change occurs much slower.⁸⁰ He also postulated that when an elite has ruled for a period of time it will develop inferior elements which will cause it to give way to the nongoverning elites who have been accumulating superior elements, this concept giving rise to a cyclical view of history in two stages, alternately conservative then progressive.⁸¹

That this concept, in modified form, exists in more contemporary considerations of change is illustrated in Michels' proposition of the "Iron Law of Oligarchy", which states that leaders tend to draw unto themselves power within the organization and retain this power, and further, that these leaders reinforce their position by co-opting new leadership amenable to their views.⁸²

79 This systems concept will be examined in detail in later chapters. For illustration, refer to Parsons, The Social System, pp. 3-23.

80 Pareto, The Mind and Society, Vol. IV, pp. 1421-1432.

81 For an analysis of this concept from the cyclical viewpoint, see Timasheff, Sociological Theory, p. 164.

82 Robert Michels, Political Parties (Glencoe, Ill.; The Free Press, 1949).

The basic concept in both of these propositions is that of power, in that existing leadership tends to build up its power until such time as this power is abused, when theoretically a new power elite will arise.⁸³

A conceptual view of the evolution of society toward a more rationalistic nature is best exemplified by the work of Max Weber.⁸⁴ In addition, Weber studied certain evolutionary factors contributing to rationalistic evolution, one of which he suggested was the protestant religion which appeared to enhance the growth of capitalism.⁸⁵ Weber also suggested a theoretically ideal type of organization within society, the bureaucratic model, which would enable a society to pursue rationality.

Considered from an aggregate viewpoint, Weber's theory of bureaucracy suggests that social and cultural change proceeds in a specified and irreversible direction, that of increasing rationality in social arrangements and practices. He suggested that capitalistic forms

83 For an interesting analysis of the power elite in American Society, see: C. Wright Mills, The Power Elite (New York: Oxford University Press, 1956). This subject will be examined in greater detail in later chapters.

84 Max Weber, The Theory of Social and Economic Organization, trans. by Talcott Parsons and A. M. Henderson (London: Hodge and Co., 1947). See also, Max Weber, From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology, trans. by H. H. Gerth and C. W. Mills (New York: Oxford University Press, 1946).

85 Max Weber, The Protestant Ethic and The Spirit of Capitalism, trans. by T. Parsons (London: George, Allen and Unwin, 1930).

of organization, based on the rational conduct of individuals, would eventually evolve into bureaucratic societies in which collective rationality of the organization replaced that of the individual character.. This final stage of development would be characterized by an almost perfect society wherein social functions would be fulfilled in the most effective manner through the bureaucratic organization.⁸⁶

Summary

It appears that the most significant contribution of the early analytical and functional approaches to the study of change remains the groundwork laid down for a comprehensive sociological theory of the processes of interaction within social systems, and the dichotomized relationships between groups.

Durkheim, for example, brought out the sociological and cultural importance of the division of labor as a change process, and in his dichotomy of individual and collective conscience and their relationship to directional orientation towards values of society provided a basis for a conceptualization of the change process.

In addition, Toennies provided a broad hypothesis in his insights into the two basic types of social groups and their

⁸⁶ For comments on Weber's postulations, see LaPiere, Social Change, p. 7, or Timasheff, Sociological Theory, p. 167-185.

interrelationship. The emphasis by Simmel on the study of the forms of society as revealed in the interactions of individuals, and Tarde's concept of invention and adaptation both form important aspects of modern sociological theory. Cooley's concept of the organic society emphasized the nature of society as a system consisting of interdependent parts in a basic state of equilibrium, thereby paralleling the work of Pareto, although Pareto provided a more comprehensive discussion of the nature of inner and external forces tending to affect system equilibrium.

Thomas provided the delineation of the concepts of social disorganization and integration, while at the same time discussing the interdependence of the individual and society in relation to attitudes and values. In addition, he propounded the concept of different change activities in different societies.

The concepts of these early analytical and functional approaches, when amalgamated with historical insights, permits the formulation of certain conclusions.

Conclusion

The analysis of the theories and concepts of these early contributors to the theories of social change points to four broad conclusions:

1 The foregoing theories do not suggest any general agreement as to uniformities which may characterise a long term trend in social change in all societies; therefore, the evolutionary viewpoint of attempting to discover universal social laws that govern human progress to some utopian ideal no longer remains valid.⁸⁷

2 With the demise of these evolutionary theories of social and cultural change, and the subsequent failure to provide a valid alternative, the analysis of long range social and cultural change is the least developed aspect of the sociological study of societies.⁸⁸

3 It is now possible, mainly through the efforts of some of the efforts of the latter early contributors to definitely discount all theories attempting to reduce the explanation of social and cultural change to a single factor, for it has been realised that many factors may operate in an interactive process to induce, enhance, or restrict such change.⁸⁹

87 This suggestion as to the demise of the evolutionary theme has been made by several sociologists, among them being LaPiere, Social Change, p. 36, and Timasheff, Sociological Theory, p. 289.

88 See, for example, LaPiere, Social Change, p. 36, Don Martindale, Social Life and Cultural Change (Princeton, N.J.: D. Van Nostrand Co., Inc., 1962), p. 2, and Timasheff, Sociological Theory p. 288.

89 The interactive nature of different factors operating to produce change with different intensities in varying societies has been

4 The real contributions of these early sociologists, especially functional and analytical ones, lay in their emphasis on the interrelationship and interdependence of a variety of factors and parts of society, therein providing the foundation of contemporary analytical, functional, and systems approaches to the analysis of change.

The functional approach, for example, which is couched in terms of explaining what aspect an individual part contributes to the whole, can be traced back particularly to the works of Durkheim, Cooley, Thomas, and Pareto, according to Timasheff.⁹⁰ The real importance of these authors, especially Cooley and Pareto, in relation to the contemporary functional approach, is their conception of the interdependent nature of the elements of society, a theme that remains valid in modern sociology.

Timasheff suggests that without the contribution of men such as Toennies, Simmel, Tarde, and Durkheim, the contemporary analytical school in sociology could not have arisen.⁹¹ The analytical sociologists

noted by several sociologists, in that it forms the basis of contemporary analysis of social change. Some of the authors who discuss this theme include, Eisenstadt, Comparative Perspectives on Social Change, pp. xiii-xiv, Miller, "Theories of Social Change," pp. 101-102, and Timasheff, Sociological Theory, pp. 306-307.

90 Timasheff, Sociological Theory, p. 221.

91 Ibid., pp. 125, 234.

of the modern day, in their attempt to construct a comprehensive and unified theory of sociology embodying the many single factor approaches, have drawn on these authors, especially Simmel's identification of society consisting of men in interaction, and Durkheim's attempts to examine the functions of collective consciousness.

Another major aspect of social change that has originated, in sociological terms, with these early contributors, are those factors that tend to inhibit change. For example, Sumner in his discussion of folkways, mores, and institutions noted the importance of long standing aspects of culture which tend to muffle the creative efforts of individuals, and Cooley's explanations of the influence of the primary group have suggested the importance of institutionalised and primary aspects of social control that tend to foster resistance to change, especially when such change disturbs existing patterns of social behavior.

In addition, the delineation by these early sociologists of specific concepts, especially social conflict, differentiation, and the progress of society through a folk-urban continuum, have provided conceptual schemes for the analysis of various aspects of the change process by contemporary empirical approaches.

In spite of the fact that these early grand theories, especially those of an evolutionary nature, have not been acceptable to

contemporary sociology, such theories still remain highly useful as contemplative rather than analytical, wherein their emphasis is on factors leading to change as an ultimate goal, rather than the process of changing itself. This latter aspect, the process of changing, requires techniques for scientific inquiry into those factors responsible for change, techniques which were not available to these early sociologists.

It is the purpose of Chapters III and IV to inquire into this problem and the present day state of theoretical thinking in the area of social change.

CHAPTER III

CONTEMPORARY ANALYTICAL AND FUNCTIONAL SOCIOLOGICAL APPROACHES TO THE ANALYSIS OF SOCIAL CHANGE

Introduction

One outstanding feature of the contemporary state of theories of social change is their lack of a viable and comprehensive theory of social change that would provide analytical techniques for the analysis of the change process in a wide variety of situations.¹ Some authors suggest a state of crisis exists in contemporary conceptual views of

¹ This lack of a viable and comprehensive theory of social change in terms of its inability to explain and delineate certain common conceptual schemes for the analysis of change in most situations is a prevalent theme in much of the literature dealing with social change. See, for example; Amitai and Eva Etzioni, eds., Social Change: Sources, Patterns, and Consequences (New York: Basic Books Inc., 1964), pp. 8-9; Stephen Cotgrove, The Science of Society (London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1967), p. 269; Richard T. LaPiere, Social Change (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1965), pp. 33-38; Don Martindale, Social Life and Cultural Change (Princeton, N.J.: D. Van Nostrand Co. Inc., 1962), p. 2; Delbert C. Miller, "Theories of Social Change", in Technology and Social Change, ed. by Allen et al (New York: Appleton Century-Crofts, Inc., 1957), pp. 101-102; Wilbert E. Moore, "A Reconsideration of Theories of Social Change", American Sociology Review, 25 (1960) 810-818; Kasper D. Nagele, "Introduction", in T. Parsons, E. Shils, K. D. Nagele, and J. R. Pitts, eds., Theories of Society, Vol. II, (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1961), p. 1207; and, Nicholas S. Timasheff, Sociological Theory: Its Nature and Growth (New York: Random House, 1957), pp. 307-308.

the nature of social change,² and Parsons, for instance, argues that contemporary sociology has not yet progressed to the point where a comprehensive theory of the sociological processes involved in social change can be developed, and therefore that sociologists must examine elements of the change process through the utilization of a conceptual scheme of the social system.³

Much of the criticism concerning the lack of a viable theory of social change appears to be based on a lack of a detailed explanation of the sociological processes of change, a problem that is exemplified in the discussion of theories of social change by Bennis, wherein he suggests this lack of explanation of processes provides no concrete basis for the planning and implementation of change in the organizational setting.⁴ Although many of the criticisms of sociologists of contemporary theories of social change in relation to the lack of explanation of detailed

2 In particular, LaPiere, Social Change, pp. 33-38, and Martindale, Social Life and Cultural Change, p. 30, suggest such a crisis because of the inability of contemporary sociological theories of change to explain the primary causative or driving forces in the change process.

3 Talcott Parsons, The Social System (New York: The Free Press, 1951), p. 534.

4 Warren G. Bennis, Changing Organizations (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1966), pp. 99-108.

change processes may be valid, in some cases these criticisms, especially when couched in terms of critiques of functional and analytical approaches which are based extensively on earlier views, tend to dismiss what sociological theory of change is available.⁵

For example, the formulation of the conceptual scheme of society as a social system consisting of interdependent parts with the sum total of these parts being greater than their individual parts is derived heavily from the work of earlier authors such as Durkheim, Pareto, Cooley, and Thomas who emphasized the interdependence of the different aspects of society.⁶

The concept of the social system forms the basis of the functional and analytical conceptualizations of the nature of social change, and

5 This tendency to dismiss functional and analytical approaches to the analysis of change, much of which is derived from earlier authors, is evident in LaPiere, Social Change, p. 34, wherein he criticizes the equilibrium concept, and also in Ralf Darendorf, "Toward A Theory of Social Conflict", in Social Change, ed., by Etzioni and Etzioni, pp. 99-111, where Darendorf suggests functional analysis does not adequately explain disintegrative forces of society arising from social conflict.

6. The centrality of this theme and the contributions of earlier authors thereto, is emphasized in Timasheff, Sociological Theory, pp. 221-222.

therefore the difference of these two approaches is more a matter of degree than absolute difference, because of this common theme.⁷ However, the functional approach tends to concentrate on the analysis of particular processes or particular social structures as they relate to the social system, whereas the analytical approach tends to the construction of theories which attempt to conceptualize the complete social system, thus providing a theoretical framework for the analysis of sociological processes, including change, as they occur within the conceptualized social system.⁸

The difference between these two approaches is best exemplified in the dialogue between Parsons and Merton, the former suggesting that "Grand Theory" is necessary for the study of sociological processes in that it provides the analytical framework within which to relate concepts and processes, whereas the latter suggests that "Middle Range" theories must be developed through the functional approach in order to provide the building blocks of sociological theory.⁹ Merton basis his argument

7 The centrality of these two approaches, primarily in terms of structural-functional analysis, is noted in Etzioni and Etzioni, eds., Social Change; pp. 76-77, Timasheff, Sociological Theory, pp. 221, 234, and Sorokin, Sociological Theories of Today (New York: Harper and Row, 1966), p. 587.

8 This difference is evident in the functional approach as advocated in Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure, pp. 3-18, and the analytical approach as advocated in Parsons, The Social System, p. vii.

9 The difference between these two approaches, and the

for middle range theories, or those theories which interrelate a number of minor working hypotheses into a unified concept, on his view that the necessary preparatory work in the formulation of grand theories encompassing wide ranges of data has not yet been accomplished.¹⁰

On the other hand, Parsons suggests that the theoretical and empirical foundations of generalized sociological theory are available, and further, that such generalized theory is necessary to provide a conceptual framework within which middle range theories can be integrated.¹¹

The basic reason for the inability of modern sociology to provide a viable theory of change is that sociologists employing the functional or analytical approaches have concluded that change itself is a function of the particular social system and the situation, in contrast to the early evolutionists who propounded general laws of

argument for the formulation of middle range theories is included in Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure, pp. 3-18.

10 Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure, pp. 5-6.

11 Parsons, The Social System, p. 555.

social change as applicable to all situations.¹²

However, contemporary sociologists have utilized some concepts of the early sociologists, especially those of differentiation, imitation, adaptation, and social conflict as they relate to the process of change, and in addition, they have concluded that certain factors of change as advanced by the pioneer sociologists do have some impact on the change process, although none of the factors would appear to operate in an isolated manner as was suggested by some of the earlier authors.¹³

For example, concepts such as differentiation, originally proposed by Comte, Durkheim, and others, social conflict, discussed extensively by Gumplowicz, and imitation and adaptation as originated

12 This situation is discussed in S. N. Eisenstadt, ed., Comparative Perspectives on Social Change (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1968), p. xiv, and it forms the basis of Parsons' discussion of the problem of social change in Parsons, The Social System, pp. 480-490. For example, Parsons discussed the different change processes involved in the revolutionary process, those of the sudden disturbance of a stable equilibrium, or the revolution, and then the subsequent gradual adaptation of the social system to the changes brought about by the revolution.

13 The contributions of these early sociologists is discussed in Eisenstadt, ed., Comparative Perspectives on Social Change, pp. xi-xx, and Timasheff, Sociological Theory pp. 221-234. The evolution of these concepts is discussed in Chapter 11, and their contemporary applicability will be discussed in this chapter.

by Tarde, all are evident in contemporary conceptualizations of the processes of social change.¹⁴ In addition, the importance of various causative factors of change as developed by the early sociologists, especially those of technology, demographic, economic, cultural, and individual intellect, remain as valid concepts in contemporary considerations of social change.¹⁵

Contemporary sociological approaches to causative factors of social change, however, tend to be formulated in multifactor terms in that it is realized that no one factor can be construed as the only cause of change, but in fact it would appear that several factors operate in an interactive manner in the causation of social change.¹⁶

More specifically, the objective of this chapter is to examine contemporary approaches to the analysis of social change by enquiring into the basic premises and concepts of leading analytical and functional sociologists.

14 For example, the contemporary approach to change in terms of differentiation is included in Talcott Parsons, "A Functional Theory of Change", in Social Change, ed. by Etzioni and Etzioni, pp. 83-97. See Chapter two for a discussion of the concepts of these early sociologists.

15 The validity of these factors as a part of contemporary approaches is noted in Eisenstadt, Comparative Perspectives on Social Change, pp. xiii-xiv, and Cotgrove, The Science of Society, pp. 274-275. See also Chapter 11 for a discussion of the factors of change as propounded by the early sociologists.

16 The multi-factor approach with its emphasis on a number of possible interdependent factors is discussed in Eisenstadt, Comparative

Contemporary Analytical and Functional Approaches

A basic contemporary premise of the study of sociological phenomena is the need to construct a unified sociological theory to serve as the conceptual framework for analysis, this premise being emphasized by a number of prominent writers in the field.¹⁷

Furthermore, the influence of earlier sociologists on such unified sociological theory is very strong, as evidenced for instance in Parson's extensive discussion of the works of Weber, Durkheim, and Pareto as these works provided the basis for Parson's conceptual scheme.¹⁸

Perspectives on Social Change, pp. xix-xx, and Cotgrove, The Science of Society, pp. 298-299.

¹⁷ The need for unified sociological theory as a guide to research is emphasized particularly in Parsons, The Social System, p. 537. Other proponents of this approach include; Marion J. Levy, The Structure of Society (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1952), Daniel Katz and Robert Kahn, The Social Psychology of Organizations (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1966), Wilbert E. Moore, Social Change (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963), and Timasheff, Sociological Theory, p. 234.

¹⁸ Talcott Parsons, The Structure of Social Action (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1959).

In addition, the basic aspect of analytical theory, that of the interrelationship of various aspects of society, is evident in the earlier works of Comte, Cooley, and others of the earlier period.

As has been mentioned, although there have been several contemporary contributions within the analytical approach, which is one method of studying the change process, the work of Parsons and Homans only will be referred to here.

These two authors have demonstrated the basic postulates of the analytical approach, that of the interaction of personality, culture, and the social system as forming a dynamic totality and in addition these two authors have attempted to examine the dynamic organization, which is characterized by constant change consisting of adaptation to innovative factors, by the application of their analytical conceptualization.

Parsons' theory of action, for example, focuses on the orientation of an actor in either motivational or value orientations.¹⁹ This motivational orientation, from which the energy necessary for action is derived, can be cognitive, or what the actor perceives in relation to his personal need system, or cathetic, wherein the actor ascribes to an object emotional meaning, or evaluative, wherein the actor must choose which of the various alternatives to which he will

19 Parsons, The Social System, pp. 3-15.

direct his energy.²⁰ The value orientation refers to the general observance of social norms and standards, in contradiction to the motivational orientation which is directed towards need fulfillment.²¹

In addition, the actor is accorded status, which refers to the relative place of the actor in the system, and he occupies a role which denotes his action, in dynamic terms, that arises from his status and which is expressed in the actor's relations with other status roles.²² A plurality of interdependent roles form an institution, this institution performing, in Parsons' theory, the primary integrative function of the social system.²³ This primary function of the institution

20 Ibid., p. 7

21 Ibid., pp. 7-15. For discussions of these basic concepts of Parsons, see, Robin M. Williams Jr., "The Sociological Theory of Talcott Parsons", in The Social Theories of Talcott Parsons, ed. by Max Black (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1961) pp. 64-99, or Timasheff, Sociological Theory, pp. 242-249. The importance of these orientation concepts of Parsons is demonstrated by their use as a basis in recent theories of role-conflict, wherein dissonance or conflict arises out of the actors difference in personal opinions as contrasted with prescribed role requirements. This is developed by L. Festinger, A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance (Evanston, Ill.: Row, Peterson, 1957) and Katz and Kahn, The Social Psychology of Organizations, among others.

22 Ibid., p. 25. For a definition of the concept of role in the organizational environment, see Katz and Kahn, The Social Psychology of Organization, pp. 48-55.

23 Ibid., pp. 36-39. This concept of Parsons is heavily derived from that of Sumner, whose concept of institutionalized patterns of behavior is discussed in Chapter 11.

of integration arises from the fact that it performs the stabilizing process of reconciling the divergent needs of personality and motivation as opposed to those of society and culture.²⁴ This problem of integration becomes evident when the individual's needs, which Maslow suggests form a hierarchial nature, cumulating in the need for self satisfaction,²⁵ are contrasted with the needs of the social system in terms of stability.

In other words, Parsons utilizes the institutional integrative process to provide the link between his three abstract analytical systems, the social system, the personality system, and the cultural system. Although the primary focus here will be on Parsons' view of the social system, the importance of the cultural system as not only a product of, but an input to, the social system, cannot be disregarded.²⁷

Parsons' view of the social system is that of a plurality of individual actors interacting with one another, their interaction being structured primarily by the cultural system, but also being affected by actor motivation arising from his personality system.²⁸ In addition,

24 Ibid., pp. 36-37.

25 A. Maslow, Motivation and Personality (New York: Harper, 1964).

26 Parsons, The Social System, p. 6.

27 Ibid., pp. 33-36 discusses Parsons' views of the cultural system.

28 Ibid., p. 5.

the social system is composed of sub systems, each of which interacts with the total system, the total then forming a dynamic system undergoing constant minor change and occasionally major change. This constant change of the social system is a result of the four major problems Parsons suggests all systems face, those of goal attainment, adaptation, integration, and latency, this last often being referred to as pattern maintenance.²⁹

The goal attainment problem refers to the necessity of the system to direct the action of actors towards system goals, whereas adaptation refers to the mobilization of the means necessary for goal attainment, or the rational manipulation of the material world which is necessary for goal attainment.³⁰ The integrative problem is that of creating and maintaining solidarity and cooperation despite the strains, or those tensions which result from conflicting needs of the personality and the social systems, involved in the process of goal attainment and adaptation.³¹ The concept of the latency problem is that of allowing

29 Ibid., pp. 157-177. For an amplification of these problems or functional imperatives of the social system see Changler Morse, "The Functional Imperatives", in The Social Theories of Talcott Parsons, ed. by Black, pp. 100-152.

30 Ibid.

31 This concept of the conflicting needs of the individual personality with the needs of the organization and the resulting conflict forms a major part of organization theory in relation to the power equalization approach, a concept that will be examined in depth in Chapter V.

the restoration or creation of energies, motives, and values of sub systems so that they can ultimately work toward goal attainment, an example of this process being that of family activities which allow actors to reconstitute capacities required by the social system.³²

Parsons' theory of action, which views the individual as a product of social and cultural systems, the whole being integrated through the institutional process, and wherein the system must meet certain problems in order to survive, presents a view of the nature of the social system as undergoing continuous change through adaptation. This view of the systems concept forms the basis of much of the contemporary open systems concept in organizational analysis, in that it stresses the dynamic aspect of the social system as undergoing continual adjustment.³³

The problem in relation to the systems concept is in its applicability in the detailed analysis of sociological phenomena wherein this concept appears to contain a degree of abstractness that precludes its empirical applicability, a problem that was recognized by Parsons when he suggested that the present state of sociological theory, due to its incompleteness, does not allow for the complete analysis of sociological processes, including that of change, in the broadest sense.³⁴ For

32 Parsons, The Social System, pp. 167-177.

33 The systems concept as it is utilized in organizational analysis will be discussed in Chapter V. See, however, Katz and Kahn, The Social Psychology of Organizations, pp. 14-29, for a review of the open systems concept.

34 Parsons, The Social System, p. 534

example, Parsons himself attempts the analysis of change in terms of sub processes, such as the revolutionary disturbance of a stable equilibrium and the subsequent adaptation to the revolutionary change, without attempting to delineate broad processes of change as applicable to all societies.³⁵

Parsons does offer some comments on the problem of social change and the analysis thereof. He suggests that the division of sociology into static and dynamic emphasis has inherent a certain falsity in that complete sociological theory, when it is developed, will be equally applicable to the analysis of change and of process within the systems perspective.³⁶

In addition, Parsons develops the work of Tonnies and Durkheim in suggesting the functional analysis of the process of change as a process of differentiation, wherein change is viewed as occurring in a social unit through the progressively increasing differentiation of functions which in turn requires additional structures within the society to carry out the additional functions resulting from differentiation.³⁷

35 Ibid., pp. 520-535.

36 Ibid., p. 535. Etzioni and Etzioni, Social Change, pp. 75-76 suggests that this view is valid, but that at the present time development of static and dynamic elements must continue.

37 Talcott Parsons, "A Functional Theory of Change", in Social Change, ed. by Etzioni and Etzioni, pp. 85-97. For the development of this concept by earlier authors, see Chapter 11.

For example, Parsons suggests that primitive families normally carry out the functions of production, education, and socialization, whereas in highly differentiated societies, often termed modern societies, these functions are performed through separate social structures, such as the factory, schools, and institutions.³⁸ Parsons relates the process of differentiation to his theory of social action by suggesting that progressive differentiation requires bridging institutions such as schools, or institutions for the resolutions of conflict such as the courts, in order to reintegrate society.³⁹

Another example of the analytical approach in the study of the process of change is the work of George Homans, who has delineated the focal point of sociology as the human group, which in itself represents a social system which can be subject to analysis.⁴⁰ Homans conceptualizes the human group as surviving in an environment wherein the group exhibits elements of behavior defined as activities, or what people actually do, interaction, or that activity which follows or is stimulated by some other activity, and sentiments, or the internal state of the actor that is reflected in his activity.⁴¹

38 Ibid.

39 Ibid., pp. 92-96.

40 This concept, originally expressed in George C. Homans, The Human Group (New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, Inc., 1950), is reviewed in Timasheff, Sociological Theory, pp. 256-257.

41 For a definition and description of these elements see, Edgar H. Schein, Organizational Psychology (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965), pp. 91-92.

In suggesting that these elements and their interaction constitute the social system, one which survives in, and interacts with, an external environment, Homans has provided an analytical technique more applicable than that of Parsons in that it is less abstract. The delineation of the elements of group action in observable and empirical terms, i.e., as what activity actually occurs as affected by social control arising from commonly accepted norms and values, suggests a method of analysis of change in terms of the analysis of observed activities in relation to social control, a method that Homans himself employed in several case studies.⁴²

This discussion of only two representative examples of the analytical approach employing the systems perspective reveals that there are two apparent difficulties inherent in such approaches. Firstly, when such approaches attempt to formulate a complete framework of the social system, they may be couched in abstract generalizations which are not readily subject to empirical analysis of the change process. For example, although such an approach emphasizes the dynamic and continually changing nature of the social system, the present state of sociological knowledge would not appear to allow for analysis of the change process in complete terms, therefore the analytical approach is restricted to the analysis of change in terms of subprocesses of change

⁴² These case studies illustrating the empirical applicability of Homan's approach are included in Homans, The Human Group, pp. 369-414.

as they relate to particular structures, such as within the family.

The second feature of these analytical approaches is that when they are formulated in empirically valid, or non abstract terms, as in the case of Homans, they tend to be restricted to smaller social units, such as the human group, where empirical study is possible.

It would therefore appear, that the intention of analytical sociologists, which is the construction of unified sociological theory which provides for the analysis of sociological processes, including change, although providing for the possible analysis of change when sociological knowledge is more complete, at the present time only provide for the analysis of sub processes of change, such as that of differentiation. A more empirically based study of change, without the tendency to abstraction of the analytical sociologists, appears to be the functional approach.

Since both the functional and analytical approaches to the analysis of the sociological phenomena of change are based on the concept of a social system consisting of interactive elements producing continuous change,⁴³ the delineation of these two approaches must be in

43 For example, Timasheff, Sociological Theory, p. 221 notes the prevalence of the acceptance of the view of the interactive nature of the social system by both approaches, and he suggests that many recent works may be classified in either approach, due to this similarity.

terms of the different level of sociological theory within which each approach attempts sociological analysis. Thus, for example, the analytical approach emphasizes the formulation of unified sociological theory which acts as a sociological framework for the analysis of data, while the functional approach tends towards the analysis of particular processes of change as they relate to particular social structures, such as the analysis of diffusion of economic change in class structure.

Thus, the functional approach involves the construction and application of working hypotheses of particular change processes in particular social structures, in order to ultimately formulate middle range theories which are applicable to the integration of parts of the society into the total society and of the interdependence of different parts of the society, without first constructing unified theory, as in the case of the analytical sociologists.⁴⁴

It is because of the emphasis of the functional sociologists on the study of the particular social structures, such as social class, as these structures are affected by particular sociological processes, such as technological change, that their approach has come to be referred to as structural-functional.⁴⁵

44 This definition of the functional approach is provided by Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure, p. 10. See also Francesca Cancian, "The Functional Analysis of Change", in Social Change ed. by Etzioni and Etzioni, pp. 112-124.

45 The development of this terminology is suggested in Timasheff, Sociological Theory, p. 222.

The unfortunate aspect of the term structural-functional is that it appears to infer the static analysis of social phenomena, a view that is incorrect in that this term embraces the study of dynamic aspects of society as they relate to structural aspects, for example, in the analysis of how particular change factors such as technological or economic, affect a given structure, such as the family or class structure.⁴⁶

One of the early classical studies embodying the functional approach was that of the Lynds, who studied a representative American community in an attempt to ascertain how such a relatively closed social system satisfied the dynamic needs, such as obtaining a living, training the young, and generally fulfilling the individual requirements for satisfaction, of the members of that society.⁴⁷

46 For example, Etzioni and Etzioni, Social Change, pp. 77-78, LaPiere, Social Change, pp. 34-36, and Sorokin, Sociological Theories of Today, pp. 587-590, suggest that the functional approach is not applicable to the analysis of change in that it tends to concentrate on the static structural aspects of the social system. However, one of the foremost of the functionalists, Merton, has contributed to the study of change, and his contributions will be examined later in this chapter.

47 Robert S. Lynd and Helen M. Lynd, Middletown: A Study In Contemporary American Culture (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1929).

This study led the Lynds to conclude that need satisfaction of individuals led to the formation of definite and distinct social structures and that each of these social structures of social classes accepted and adapted to change in different ways, for example, certain classes tended to adapt more readily to technological change than others.⁴⁸ The Lynds also suggested, however, certain uniformities in the acceptance and adaptation of change, in that they found that certain types of change, such as those of a material nature, tended to be accepted more readily than other types of change, such as social changes in the husband wife interaction patterns, these latter changes being less acceptable.⁴⁹

This emphasis of the early functional studies on the relationship of class structure to change was also evident in the work of William L. Warner, who postulated that social interaction, when organized into defined relationships produces systems of formal and informal groups allied in social structures which in turn regulate the behavior of individuals.⁵⁰ He then suggested that the integration of these social

48 A summarized version of these conclusions is provided in Timasheff, Sociological Theory, pp. 223-224.

49 These suggestions, originally put forward in Lynd and Lynd, Middletown, are discussed in Timasheff, Sociological Theory, pp. 223-224. In addition, a subsequent publication of the Lynds, Robert S. Lynd and Helen M. Lynd, Middletown In Transition: A Study In Cultural Conflicts (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1937), emphasizes the relationship to economic and political power variables of class structure.

50 These concepts were originally suggested in William L. Warner, and Paul S. Hunt, The Social Life of a Modern Community (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1941).

structures such as the church or family occurs through one primary structure which provides the framework for all others, this being the class structure in American society, and he demonstrated that economic, geographic, and ethnic factors cause different class structures, and thereby illustrated the importance of these factors in causing different change processes.⁵¹

This emphasis on the integrative aspects of American society, in the early functional studies, is followed by Robin M. Williams, who suggests that four basic means of integration, mutual dependence of individual interests, cohesion mechanisms, reaction to external pressures, and common acceptance of values and symbols, provide for the integration of different autonomous institutions of society.⁵² After delineating these integrative aspects of American society, Williams suggests that this society is characterised by a value system which tends to encourage rapid change of economic and technological variables, and further, that economic or technical change tends to overcome the social regulation arising from the integrative aspects of society through a process of self generation and accumulation of its own forces of change.⁵³ In

51 For a summary of these views, originally expressed in Warner and Hunt, The Social Life of a Modern Community, see Timasheff, Sociological Theory, pp. 224-225.

52 These concepts were originally suggested in Robin M. Williams, American Society: A Sociological Interpretation (New York: Knopf, 1951).

53 Williams, American Society, p. 571.

supporting this view, he suggests that aspects of American society not emphasizing the technical or economic aspects of change, such as the church, tend to follow rather than lead in the initiation of change.⁵⁴

One of the foremost proponents of the functional approach is Robert K. Merton, who after criticising his functionalist confreres for not devoting sufficient attention to the study of basic changes in social structure, has enumerated a concept of the change process primarily in terms of dysfunctional strain within the social system from which change results.⁵⁵

Merton contends that the dynamic aspect of the functional approach is the study of strain, tension, contradiction, or discrepancy between social and cultural systems wherein such strain or tension may be dysfunctional within the society in that they may overcome social mechanisms of control and result in change, or even when such strain is

54 These concepts of change as it occurs in the American society which originated from Williams, American Society, are discussed in Loomis, Modern Social Theories, pp. 588-590.

55 These criticisms of Merton's of the functionalist emphasis on structure are in Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure, p. 116, and further criticisms in the same vein are offered by Etzioni and Etzioni, Social Change, pp. 77-78. Merton's own concept of the change process is introduced in Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure, p. 116. For a summarized discussion of Merton's individual hypothesis relating to the concept of change, see, Loomis, Modern Social Theories, pp. 616-617.

controlled by the social control mechanisms, it may result in minor change of the control mechanism.⁵⁶

In addition, Merton has introduced or refined other concepts than that of dysfunctional strain that are particularly relevant to the analysis of change in that they represent an attempt to provide methodological definitions for empirical analysis, these concepts being the definition of function in society, that of manifest and latent functions, and that of functional alternatives.⁵⁷ Although Merton's definition of function as "those observed consequences which make for the adaptation and adjustment of a given system"⁵⁸ differs from Levy's definition in that Levy suggests a function must be related to the operation of a particular structure of society through time,⁵⁹ Merton's concept of function has more relation to the study of change. For example, Merton's term "Observable consequences" suggests an empirically applicable methodology in that it views the analysis of change as an observable, and therefore testable, adaptation of a social system.

56 Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure, pp. 116-117.

57 Ibid., pp. 21-81, and especially p. 51 discusses these concepts.

58 Ibid., p. 50.

59 Marion J. Levy, Jr., The Structure of Society (Princeton N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1952), pp. 56-57.

Merton's concept of manifest and latent functions, wherein manifest functions refer to intended objective consequences of adoption or adjustment in a social unit whereas latent functions refer to unintended or unrecognized consequences of adjustment,⁶⁰ suggests that the analysis of social change can be done through two aspects, those of the change as intended, or unintended. For example, planned social change such as the alteration of a given social structure, may possibly result in the intended result of the change, which could be an increase in organizational efficiency, but such change will also probably result in unintended or latent changes which may in fact introduce strain resulting in dysfunctional change.⁶¹

In addition, Merton's concept of functional alternatives, wherein a range of possible variant items can serve a functional requirement,⁶² or where several possible directions of change are possible, in terms of the need to serve a functional requirement through change, illustrates that there is no functional indispensibility of a given structure and therefore change can occur in several alternative directions or through alternative structures.

60 Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure, p. 51

61 The importance of the concepts of manifest and latent functions in the methodological analysis of change is noted in Levy, Jr., The Structure of Society, pp. 84-88, Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure, pp. 79-80, and Timasheff, Sociological Theory, p. 230.

62 Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure, p. 52.

These concepts of Merton's are of importance in the analysis of change in that dysfunction, as it results in strain and possible subsequent change, have provided the basis of Merton's analysis of dysfunctions in bureaucracy⁶³ and also in that manifest and latent functions suggest that particular elements may be dysfunctional for some parts of the system and functional for others.⁶⁴ In fact, much of the recent work in organizational theory as it pertains to change, especially in relation to the relationship of individuals to the bureaucratic structure in terms of dysfunction, arises from the work of Merton.⁶⁵

Another proponent and supporter of the functional approach is Cancian, who suggests a functional approach to the study of change in terms of disintegration, prerequisite changes, and corrective changes.⁶⁶

63 See, for example, Robert K. Merton, "Bureaucratic Structure and Personality", in Reader in Bureaucracy, ed. by Merton et al (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1952) pp. 361-371. This concept of dysfunction will be examined in greater depth in Chapter 4.

64 This suggestion as to the application of these functions is made in Wilbert E. Moore, Social Change (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1963), p. 9.

65 The concept of dysfunction in bureaucracy as it underlies much of organizational theory relating to change, and its basis for the peoples approach to change in organizations will be examined in Chapter V.

66 Francesca Cancian, "Functional Analysis of Change", in Social Change, ed. by Etzioni and Etzioni, pp. 112-124. The use of functional analysis in determining the functional prerequisites of a social unit necessary for it to come into being is discussed in Levy, The Structure of Society, pp. 72-76.

Cancaian suggests that functional theory can specify the functional prerequisites of a system without which the system disintegrates, it can analyse and suggest changes which are necessary for the maintenance of stability in the system, and further, that functional theory can analyse corrective changes wherein the system attempts to restore its equilibrium after deviation has occurred.⁶⁷ Unfortunately, however, Cancaian did not advance beyond the proposition of a model, couched in terms of a "G" factor denoting a state of equilibrium,⁶⁸ and therefore her suggestions must remain as just that, unsupported contentions.

A structural functionalist sociologist who has further developed the concept of strain as it disturbs a stable equilibrium is Howard Becker, who suggested the view that social change occurs in an equilibrium cycle wherein factors such as tension, unrest, or crisis served to disturb the existing equilibrium, this disturbance in turn resulting in three possible alternatives, a new more efficient equilibrium, destruction, or a less efficient equilibrium.⁶⁹ He adds that

67 Ibid., pp. 119-120.

68 Ibid., p. 114.

69 This version of Becker's concept of change is presented in Loomis, Modern Social Theories, pp. 639-644. The importance of this cyclical concept of change becomes evident when some of the organizational considerations of change, such as that of John A. Seiler, Systems Analysis In Organizational Behavior (Homewood Ill.: Richard D. Irwin and the Dorsey Press, 1967) which emphasize this aspect are examined in Chapter VI.

this cycle will be repeated, especially if the new state was that of destruction or less efficient equilibrium because these two states would generate additional tension for a more efficient state.⁷⁰ This concept of Becker's reiterates the importance of strain or tension in the change process, and it also points out the dialectic nature of change.

An example of the applied functional approach, or the analysis of sociological processes as they relate to a social structure, is that of Washburne, who has suggested that the basic structure of institutions in the United States has moved in the direction of increased bureaucratization and urbanization as the result of pressures such as mechanical inventions, population movements, changes in natural resources, and the effects of neighbouring societies.⁷¹ He suggests that these changes have created dysfunctions with the result that individuals respond to charismatic and utopian aspects of social movements, and he adds that such changes require changes in other sectors of society, thereby giving rise to waves of social change.⁷²

An approach to the study of change that is closely related to the structural-functional approach, and one that is heavily employed in

70 Loomis, Modern Social Theories, p. 643.

71 Norman F. Washburne, Interpreting Social Change In America (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday and Co., 1954).

72. Ibid., p. 48

analysis in other areas such as economics,⁷³ is that of cybernetic analysis.⁷⁴ The cybernetic approach adheres to the functional approach in that it assumes equilibrium of a system which is affected by conditions that tend to maintain stability and conditions that undermine this stability, and also in that systems have feedback mechanisms that allow them to respond to the environment and correct deviant aspects, but where necessary, such systems can introduce new mechanisms when deviation is extensive.⁷⁵

The difference in the cybernetic approach arises from its derivation from computer and machine models, wherein it is not yet possible to cover all relationships of social phenomena due to the problem of quantification. For example, this approach tends to consider primarily rational aspects of behavior, and it does not cover irrational aspects such as differences in power positions, or expressive communication wherein emotional meaning is transmitted.⁷⁶ However, in spite of the

73 For a discussion of the use of this approach in the field of economics, a use that is facilitated by the use of quantifiable measurement in this field, see Kenneth E. Boulding, Economic Analysis, 3rd ed., (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1955), pp. 3-14.

74 This approach is discussed in Etzioni and Etzioni, eds., Social Change, pp. 81-82.

75 These similarities are discussed in Etzioni and Etzioni, Social Change, p. 81.

76 Ibid.

fact that there are serious limitations to the cybernetic approach due to its lack of coverage of irrational aspects, this approach does allow for the analysis of rational aspects of change where such aspects and their interrelationship can be quantified and measured.⁷⁷

The structural-functional approach is certainly not without its critics, as demonstrated by the following suggestions as to its faults. For example, Darendorf suggests that structural-functional theory is adequate for the analysis of the integrative forces of society, but he argues that it is not adequate for the analysis of the forces of disruption and change because of its emphasis on the static aspects of social structures.⁷⁸ That there is some validity to this argument is suggested by one of the foremost of the functionalists, Merton, who directs criticism at his confreres for their emphasis on the static aspects of society.⁷⁹

77 For an extensive discussion of this approach, its use, examples, and problems involved, see Mervyn L. Cadwaller, "The Cybernetic Analysis of Change", in Social Change, ed. by Etzioni and Etzioni, pp. 159-164.

78 Ralf Darendorf, "Toward a Theory of Social Conflict", in Social Change, ed. by Etzioni and Etzioni, pp. 98-111.

79 Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure, p. 116.

Some additional suggestions as to the limitations of this approach are made by Timasheff, who suggests that it has inherent a methodological deficiency due to its dependence on a sociological observer who determines functions and consequences, and in addition Timasheff suggests the lack of a central theme of this approach with which to relate various concepts is also a serious deficiency.⁸⁰

However, in spite of the methodological and conceptual criticisms of this approach, it is probably one of the better approaches available for sociological analysis of change, as Parsons suggests.⁸¹

Summary

The analytical sociologists, who derived much of their approach from the equilibrium concepts of the early sociologists, in their quest for the construction of unified sociological theory in order to provide a framework for the analysis of sociological processes, have provided some contributions in relation to the analysis of change. For example, the work of both Parsons and Homans emphasizes the nature of change as

⁸⁰ Timasheff, Sociological Theory, pp. 231-232. The majority of these criticisms are discussed in Etzioni and Etzioni, Social Change, pp. 77-78.

⁸¹ Parsons, The Social System, p. 534. The importance and application of the functional approach in the analysis of change is discussed in Amatai Etzioni, Studies in Social Change, (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1966), pp. v-vii, and in Levy, The Structure of Society, pp. 71-76.

continuous, being caused by and in turn causing other change, and the nature of change as subject to a variety of interactive forces and processes.

In addition, the suggestion of Parsons as to the necessity of developing sociological theory to cover both static and dynamic aspects of sociological analysis would appear to be valid, although at the present state of the development of sociological theory it would not appear possible. Parsons has also offered some concepts of direct applicability to the analysis of change, primarily that of differentiation of functions as society develops, and he has also emphasized the position of institutions as the primary integrative, and hence in opposition to change, aspects of society.

The work of Homans, in that it is concentrated on a lower level of sociological analysis than that of Parsons, which has as its central focus the analysis of change in the human group in terms of the activities, interaction, and sentiments of group members, has provided a more empirically operationalized method of analysis of change.

The work of both Parsons and Homans serves to illustrate the inherent problem of the analytical approach to change, which arises from the difficulty of operationalizing and validating a large number of possible interactive variables which may be operative in the change process. Thus, the analytical approach would appear to be couched in terms too abstract for the analysis of the change process at this time,

although future developments of sociological theory may allow for more complete analysis of change within the analytical framework.

The structural-functional approach, on the other hand, has tended to concentrate on the analysis of change in terms of particular processes, such as that of conflict, and in relation to particular structures, such as the class structure of society, and as a result this approach has provided more insight than the analytical approach into what may be termed the sub-processes of change.

For example, the Lynds have demonstrated that change is accepted and diffused in different ways in different social classes, and at the same time they have suggested certain uniformities of the change process. Thus, they found that different social classes, especially upper as opposed to lower social-economic classes, tended to accept change differently, while they also concluded that certain types of change, such as material types, tended to be accepted more readily than other types, such as social changes in interpersonal relationships, in all classes of the society they examined.

Another functionalist, Warner, viewed the primary integrative aspect of American society as the class structure which acts as the framework of society, and which in turn is determined and affected or changed as a result of factors such as economic, geographic, and ethnic variables. The work of Williams tended to stress also the integrative

forces of society, although he suggested the importance of the value or cultural system of a society as it relates to change. This was done by suggesting that certain societies, such as the American one, tended to possess a value system which condones and encourages rapid change, especially rapid technological change.

It was the work of the noted sociologist, Robert Merton, however, which emphasized the functional approach to the analysis of change. His contributions to the functionalist methodological approach, in terms of delineating functions and dysfunctions, manifest and latent functions, and functional alternatives, has provided empirically applicable concepts that are applicable in the analysis of change. For example, Merton's own view of the change process as arising from the dysfunctions of society which result in stress, strain, or tension which necessitates change of the control mechanisms of society or of the society itself have become some of the most widely applied concepts in the analysis of change.

This is illustrated in the work of Cancian and Becker, the former who suggested the functional analysis of change as change can be observed in disintegration, corrective and prerequisite changes of society necessary to maintain a stable equilibrium. Becker has provided a model of the change process which relates the concept of strain or tension to the disturbance of the social system's equilibrium, and he has also pointed out the dialectic nature of change by noting that

each new state of equilibrium results from strain in a previous state.

The cybernetic approach to the analysis of change, which has been derived from computer applications in fields such as economics and which also relates to the functional approach, although limited by its inability to deal with irrational and non quantifiable aspects of change, may provide some insight into change in situations where the interrelationship and affect of variables can be quantified.

The structural functional approach, however, still receives criticism in terms of its inferred concentration on static analysis of sociological phenomena, its lack of a central theme, and its methodological limitations.

This examination of contemporary approaches to the analysis of sociological considerations of social change cannot be completed without examining another group of sociologists whose suggestions in relation to the change process can be considered neither analytical or functional, although they are very similar. These additional sociological considerations generally tend to be more general than the middle range theory approach of the functionalists, but less abstract than the generalized sociological theory of the analytical sociologists.

CHAPTER IV

OTHER CONTEMPORARY SOCIOLOGICAL CONCEPTUALIZATIONS OF PROCESSES OF SOCIAL CHANGE

Introduction

The dominant characteristic of these other contemporary sociological conceptualizations is that they have suggested one, or at most a few, elements of the change process as being applicable to a wide variety of levels of social structure as well as within several institutional spheres.¹

In this concentration on a few elements of the process of social change, they differ from the analytical sociologists who have attempted to construct unified sociological theory which would act as an analytical framework for the study of sociological phenomena, including change.² However, these sociologists examined here do accept the basic tenant of both the analytical and functional approaches, that of the interdependence of various parts of the social system, with this

¹ This characteristic of these sociologists is suggested by Amitai Etzioni and Eva Etzioni, eds., Social Change, Sources, Patterns and Consequences (New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers), p. 403.

² See Chapter III for a discussion of the analytical and functional approaches to the analysis of change.

interdependence resulting in change in one aspect of society which causes strain and resulting change in other sectors.

In addition, these sociologists differ from the functional sociologists in that their view of the applicability of their concepts to a wide variety of social levels and spheres is more generalized than the functionalists who attempt to concentrate on middle range theories applicable to particular social structures and particular processes, such as the relationship of the diffusion of change to class structure.³ However, the illustrations and explanations of these sociologists of their concepts tend to be very similar to the functionalist explanations of change in that both utilize particular examples and structures in the illustration of concepts.⁴

More specifically, this chapter will attempt the following:

- 1 The delineation of a conceptual framework within which the various concepts of these authors can be integrated and related.

- 2 The examination of the concepts of these authors in terms of social disorganization and conflict, innovation, accumulation, and termination of change.

3 A discussion of the functionalist approach and its concentration on middle range theory is contained in Chapter III.

4 The similarity of these two approaches is particularly evident in their common emphasis on the importance of the concept of strain or conflict inducing change. See for example, the concepts of strain and tension of Merton discussed in Chapter III.

3 A summary of the contemporary state of sociological considerations of change, including analytical and functional approaches.

The Conceptual Framework

In an attempt to provide a broad conceptual scheme within which to relate the contributions of these sociologists, Etzioni and Etzioni have suggested that the change process can be viewed as consisting of a beginning, a middle, and an end, these three stages being termed respectively initiation, diffusion, and termination.⁵ This conceptual scheme of the broad change process views social change in terms of conflict resulting in social disorganization, which then requires the initiation of new patterns of behavior, or innovation, this innovation then being accepted, diffused, and accumulated until such time as the change process is terminated, or ended.⁶

In addition, this conceptual scheme has inherent the equilibrium concept, which suggests that disorganization occurs as a result of internal or external strains or conflict on this equilibrium, this strain then necessitating a new state of equilibrium and of integration which can only be achieved through change.⁷ This equilibrium concept is

5 Etzioni and Etzioni, Social Change, p. 403.

6 Ibid., pp. 403-410.

7 Ibid., p. 403.

derived from the work of the early sociologists, particularly Pareto, who viewed society as continually striving and changing in an attempt to maintain a stable equilibrium.⁸

This conceptual scheme of Etzioni and Etzioni serves to illustrate the existing views of contemporary sociology as to the origins of social change, in that change is viewed as the result of an interplay of causative factors producing conflict and subsequently social disorganization, this view suggesting an analytical framework for the analysis of change in terms of social conflict.⁹ Therefore, the social system must react to the disorganization through the process of initiation of innovation, adaptation to the innovation, and then termination, in order to either return to the original state of equilibrium or else, if fundamental changes are involved, to institute a new equilibrium state.

Thus, because very few modern social systems have a well integrated need satisfaction system which meets the demands of its participants, continuous social change occurs, and this change will be either

8 These concepts of Pareto's are discussed in Chapter II. This equilibrium concept is evident in the work of other early sociologists, also discussed in Chapter II, such as Durkheim, Tarde and others.

9 The concept of social disorganization as the result of the interplay of factors is emphasized in Cotgrove, The Science of Society, pp. 277-295, Etzioni and Etzioni, eds., Social Change, p. 405, and Eisenstadt, Comparative Perspectives on Social Change, pp. xxi, xxiii. In addition, this perspective forms the foundation to the systems view of the change process.

minor modification, or basic modification of complete structures.¹⁰ Thus, the problem of sociological analysis of change is the examination of the process of social disorganization in order to attempt an explanation thereof as the foundation of the theory of social change.¹¹

Social Disorganization and Conflict

Darendorf, for example, postulates an approach to the analysis of social change which is based on the examination of the dysfunctionality of elements of the social structure and the restrictive nature of social unity.¹² He further suggests that since the goal of social theory should be the explanation of social change, therefore the sociological theory of conflict must develop a model which allows for the analysis of the structural origin of social conflict.¹³ In addition, he suggests that

10 The delineation of change as minor or major is suggested in Etzioni and Etzioni, Social Change, p. 404.

11 The foundation of the theory of social change as it arises from social disorganization is evident in the emphasis of contemporary sociology on the nature of stress or strain as the basis of change.

12 Darendorf, "Toward a Theory of Social Conflict", pp. 98-111.

13 Ibid., p. 105

conflict theory must answer three basic questions: firstly, the origin of conflicting groups in society; secondly, the forms of group struggles; and thirdly, how does such conflict effect change in the social structure?¹⁴

The importance of Darendorf's view of the necessity to study social conflict as the basis of social change is that it provides a suggested framework for the analysis of change.

The relationship of social conflict and social change has been further examined by Coser, who attempts to examine the functions of conflict within systems and then postulate a relation of social conflict and change of systems.¹⁵

Coser suggests that groups or individuals are led to question the legitimacy of the present system through a variety of factors, such as economic, technological, or others, and also that previous change may be a source of such questioning of established patterns.¹⁶ The operation of these factors, according to Coser, results in strain or frustration which is manifested in two directions: either that of groups acting out and relieving tensions through safety valve institutions or deviant behavior, or through the emergence of complete new patterns of behavior on the part of groups.¹⁷ He then postulates that if new patterns of

14 Ibid., pp. 104-105

15 Lewis A. Coser, "Social Conflict and the Theory of Social Change", in The Sociological Perspective, Introductory Readings, ed. by Scott G. McNall (Boston, Little Brown, and Co., 1968), pp. 283-293.

16 Ibid., p. 291.

17 Ibid.

behavior are produced as the result of strain, change will occur in one of two ways.¹⁸ If the social system is flexible enough to adjust to the new patterns of behavior, change will occur within the system, but if the system is inflexible or rigid, the new patterns of behavior will accumulate a new value system and it may become powerful enough to overcome the rigidity and break down the existing patterns, resulting in change of the system.

The importance of this concept of Coser's is the delineation of a possible change process in terms of group or individual reaction to strain producing factors to cause change either within the system or of the system.

This concept of social disorganization and some of the main causes is discussed by Faris who suggests that disorganization, or the failure of institutional mechanisms to control behavior, can be attributed mostly to the modernization of societies.¹⁹ He suggests that the attendant problems of population growth and urbanization cause much of the disorganization of modern social systems, and he adds that this

¹⁸ Ibid., Much of these postulations of Coser's as to the source of strain within the social system is based on the Marxist concept of the class struggle.

¹⁹ Robert E. Faris, "Contemporary and Prospective Social Disorganization", in Social Change, ed. by Etzioni and Etzioni, pp. 413-417.

disorganization will require reorganization processes in order to provide system stability.²⁰ In addition, he suggests that such reorganization can be gradually accomplished over a long period of time through the formation of new values, or else it may be dramatic and sudden, as in the case of revolution.

In assuming the validity of these concepts of the nature of social change arising from social disorganization, the next stage is to examine the methods whereby society attempts to readjust to a stable equilibrium and deal with the resultant strain or tension arising from social disorganization. These methods of society for dealing with social disorganization are generally those of adaptation to the disorganization through the initiation of innovation, the diffusion and accumulation of such innovation, and finally, the termination of this innovation.

Innovation

The concept of initiation, as it relates to the decreasing of social disorganization, is usually referred to in terms of innovation which involves the introduction of initiation of new patterns of behavior, new attitudes, or new techniques.²¹

²⁰ Ibid., pp. 416-417.

²¹ This definition is suggested by Etzioni and Etzioni, eds., Social Change, p. 405.

Innovation may, as Etzioni and Etzioni suggest, be consciously planned, or it may be spontaneous, and its acceptance in the society depends on the urgency of social needs, the degree of disorganization, the flexibility of the society, and on the degree to which change has been institutionalized within the society.²² Generally speaking, the more dynamic a society, the more tolerant it is towards innovation, as in the case of many modern societies wherein innovation in areas such as science and technology is highly institutionalized and encouraged.²³

However, as Kallen suggests, modern societies do encounter resistance to change due to emotional attachment to previously established patterns of behavior.²⁴ In addition, Linton points out that all innovations are accepted in different degrees, depending on how they fit in with existing needs and interests of that society.²⁵

22 Ibid., p. 406.

23 For a comprehensive discussion of the innovative process, see Horace M. Kallen, "Innovation", in Social Change, ed. by Etzioni and Etzioni, pp. 427-430, this article having been reprinted from Seligman and Johnson, eds., The Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences (New York: Macmillan, 1937).

24 Ibid., p. 430.

25 Ralph Linton, "Discovery, Invention and Their Cultural Setting", in Social Change, ed. by Etzioni and Etzioni, pp. 431-436.

One particular aspect of the initiation of innovation that has received recent emphasis is the role of the individual as of primary importance in the initiation of innovation, this emphasis probably resulting from the cultural orientation of much of modern society towards the importance of the individual acting in an entrepreneurial function.²⁶

One of the more interesting of these approaches is that of McClelland, who suggests that the main force that propels societies into change is not in environmental factors, ideas, or social conflict, but in individuals who possess high achievement motivation.²⁷ McClelland suggests that such achievement drive is acquired in the formative years and is a product of the social structure of the family and culture. He further suggests that the potential of a society for growth in the future can be predicted through the analysis of children's literature to see if it stresses an achievement orientation, and if so, that society would tend to produce individuals with an orientation towards progress and growth.²⁸

26 This suggestion as to the prominence of this approach in recent years is made by Etzioni and Etzioni, eds., Social Change, p. 82.

27 These concepts were originally outlined in David C. McClelland, The Achieving Society (Princeton, N.J.: D. Van Nostrand, 1961). A summarized version thereof is provided in David C. McClelland, "Business Drive and National Achievement", in Social Change, ed. by Etzioni and Etzioni, pp. 165-178.

28 McClelland, "Business Drive and National Achievement", pp. 172-173.

The economist Everett Hagen adopted a similar approach to that of McClelland's when he suggests that the forces which tend to disturb societal equilibrium are in terms of the need for achievement among a sufficiently large proportion of the population that this need can result in social change.²⁹ He offers a "status withdrawal" hypothesis which suggests that over a period of generations the need for achievement is developed in the non elite classes of a society, which results in a group of creative individuals possessed of a desire to prove themselves, and if necessary, they will create new roles within which to satisfy the achievement need.³⁰ Thus, in seeking new roles, primarily in terms of economic progress, these individuals institute social change in forms of government, i.e., towards representative government, and they tend to destroy existing elites that do not conform to their concepts.

Another author, LaPiere suggests that society operates constantly and consistently towards self-maintenance, and that all forms of social organization are inherently resistant to change, and that therefore social change does not arise from within the society, it arises from the work of individuals acting in deviant and asocial methods.³¹

29 This concept is the basis of Everett E. Hagen, On the Theory of Social Change (Homewood, Ill.: The Dorsey Press, Inc., 1962).

30 A summarized version of this theory of Hagen's is available in Tom Burns and S. B. Saul, eds., Social Theory and Economic Change (London, Tavistock Publications, 1967), pp. 2-5.

31 LaPiere, Social Change, p. 39.

A slightly different approach is adopted by Martindale, who suggests that certain groups or communities tend to foster the predominance of a creative minority who play a significant part in the change process.³²

The work of McClelland, Hagen, LaPiere, and Martindale has served to illustrate that deviant individuals acting in asocial ways can be considered as an important part of the change process, and when combined with other variables such as conflict and innovation, it becomes an important aspect of the change process.³³

Accumulation and Cultural Lag

The acceptance of innovation within a society through the process of diffusion has formed the focus of concentration of some sociologists.³⁴

32 This theme is evident in Martindale, Social Life and Cultural Change.

33 R. M. MacIver, "The Role of the Precipitant", in Social Change, ed. by Etzioni and Etzioni, pp. 423-426, suggests that the individual should not be considered as the sole generator of social change, but as a trigger that simply sets off the change reaction in a society that is ready for such change. For a critique of this approach, See Burns and Saud, Social Theory and Economic Change, pp. 5-8.

34 Etzioni and Etzioni, eds. Social Change, p. 406.

The concept of accumulation is closely allied with that of diffusion in that accumulation refers to the process whereby an invention spreads from one sector of the society to another. This concept of accumulation, as originally suggested by Robin Williams and his view of economic factors of American society as they spread through the society by a process of self generation, has been elaborated on by Myrdal, who suggests that an invention or innovation gathers additional momentum as it starts to spread, and as a result it triggers change in other sectors as well as the original one.³⁵

Myrdal provides an interesting suggestion that employing the concept of accumulation, it should be possible to break into the de-segregation cycle of race relations and institute improvement, this improvement then, through accumulation, providing improvement in other sectors of the race relations problem.³⁶

The aspect of change as it spreads from one sector of the society to another has been examined by William Ogburn, who has suggested that the social or cultural lag between initial innovation and adaptive responses causes maladjustment in society which results in strain in society.³⁷ Thus, in Ogburn's concept, the longer the lag

35 Gunnar Myrdal, "The Principle of Cumulation", in Social Change, ed. by Etzioni and Etzioni, pp. 455-458.

36 Ibid., pp. 456-457.

37 This concept was originally outlined in William F. Ogburn, Social Change with Respect to Culture and Original Nature, (New York:

between innovation and adaptation, the greater the strain, with the possibility of disintegration of the society if this period of lag is long enough.³⁸

In attempting to suggest the origin of the change process, Ogburn originally appeared to suggest that material factors, primarily technological and economic, tended to change first, thus forcing culture to adapt thereto, but in the later edition of his book he qualifies this by suggesting there may be cases where nonmaterial factors may originate the change process.³⁹

B. W. Huebsch, Inc., 1922), but it has been updated and revised slightly in William F. Ogburn, Social Change with Respect to Culture and Original Nature (New York: The Viking Press, 1950).

38 For comments on this concept of Ogburn's, see Etzioni and Etzioni, eds., Social Change, p. 407, or LaPiere, Social Change, p. 31.

39 The differences between Ogburn's original and revised concepts is discussed in Miller, "Theories of Social Change", pp. 86-88.

Termination

The concept of termination of change is, as Etzioni and Etzioni point out, one of the areas in which little or no sociological inquiry has been directed, although it would appear that termination can occur at any point in any sector prior to and including the disintegration of that society.⁴⁰ In addition, as Kaplan points out, termination of one process may serve as the initiation point of another process when a new state of equilibrium is formed in the social system.⁴¹

In an attempt to provide for the analysis of the change process from its inception to its termination, Etzioni has suggested a model for the study of the complete process of political unification.⁴²

He suggests that the development of new social units depends on performance, power, and communication, and that such development proceeds at different rates in different societies, with the basis of his model being the process of differentiation as outlined by Parsons.⁴³

40 Etzioni and Etzioni, eds., Social Change, pp. 403-409.

41 This is suggested when the processes of initiation and termination are linked in Morton A. Kaplan, "Essential Rules and Rules of Transformation," in Social Change, ed. by Etzioni and Etzioni, pp. 476-480.

42 Amitai Etzioni, "The Epigenesis of Political Unification", in Social Change, ed. by Etzioni and Etzioni, pp. 481-497.

43 Ibid., p. 492.

Summary

The concepts and contributions of these various authors who have examined particular elements of the processes of social change become particularly meaningful when viewed in the perspective of the conceptual framework developed by Etzioni and Etzioni wherein the change process is viewed as arising from disorganization and passing through the stages of initiation of innovation, diffusion, accumulation, and ultimately, termination.⁴⁴

For example, Darendorf and his suggestion that sociology should study the nature of group conflict as the basis of change provides a starting point for the analysis of change. In addition, the suggestions of Coser as to the direction of strain or conflict in terms of deviant behavior or the emergence of new patterns of behavior suggest an analytical dichotomy for the analysis of change, especially when viewed in the context of his concepts of the flexible as opposed to the rigid society and their different initiation and diffusion of change.

Also, Faris has suggested one of the causes of social disorganization as the strain resulting from the urbanization of modern society, and his view of the reorganization process as gradual or dramatic provides an illustration of possible time frames of change resulting from disorganization. The views of the innovative process,

⁴⁴ Ibid., p. 403.

mostly derived from the early work of Gabriel Tarde, provide suggestions as to the relative probabilities of adoption of innovation depending on the type of society, this concept being evident in the work of Kallen and Linton.

The work of authors such as McClelland, Hagen, and LaPiere has served to illustrate that individuals acting in asocial manners in order to fulfill personal needs may have an important part in the process of the initiation of change.

The concepts of accumulation and cultural lag as propounded by Myrdal and Ogburn suggest the possibility that change factors accumulate energy through a self generation process as they diffuse throughout different sectors of society, and further, that the acceptance of innovation is not uniform in all sectors, this lack of uniform acceptance resulting in strain within the society.

Conclusions Regarding Contemporary Approaches to Social Change

The study and analysis of the foregoing contemporary sociological approaches to the concept of social change suggests three broad conclusions: .

- 1 That although there are several suggestions and theoretical approaches to the process of change and its explanation, there is not yet a comprehensive, unified sociological theory which encompasses the complete process of change, nor is there any theoretical approach which

interrelates and unifies the number of sociological concepts regarding change that have been promulgated.⁴⁵

2 Contemporary sociological approaches have accepted the concept of changes occurring continuously, as of a dialectic nature, and as of resulting from a number of factors operating in an interactive mode.⁴⁶ In other terminology, the contemporary sociological approaches to change, whatever they may be designated as, at least adhere to the systems concept of change, in that change, or processes thereof, is no longer conceptualized in terms of isolated and independent concepts.

3 That although the analytical approach, especially that of Parsons, has attempted to provide unified and comprehensive sociological theory acting as a framework for analysis of sociological phenomena, at the present time sociological theory has not yet advanced to the point where such general systems theory is directly applicable in empirical analysis of change. Due to this abstraction of general systems theory, empirically applicable concepts of social change have tended to arise from primarily functional analysis of social change.

45 This is illustrated by Nagele, "Introduction" in Theories of Society, Vol. II, p. 1222, who suggests that his summary of concepts of social change "represents an opening of issues rather than a reporting of confirmed agreement". For discussions of the large number of unanswered questions regarding change, see Nagele, "Introduction" in Theories of Society, Vol. II, p. 1208, or Sorokin, Sociological Theories of Today, pp. 587-589.

46 This is suggested by Nagele, "Introduction" in Theories of Society, Vol. II, pp. 1213-1222.

Rather than suggesting, however, that contemporary sociological approaches to the analysis of social change have failed completely, it must be pointed out that all branches of sociological approaches have contributed particular conceptual schemes for the analysis of the change process in certain aspects.

For example, the analytical approach through the discussion of systems or models of society for the examination of social processes, have emphasized the importance of the nature of the organization as an interactive system undergoing continuous and dialectic change and of change as arising from a number of interactive factors. In addition, their work in the delineation of social systems has suggested points of entry into the system for the study of change, such as Parsons and institutionalization as it affects the actor, or Homans and his definition of activities, interaction, and sentiments.

In addition, the functional approach has provided several suggestions for the analysis of change. The Lynds for example, demonstrated differences in the diffusion of changes in social class, and also uniformities in the diffusion of some changes, i.e., material as opposed to social changes. Warner has demonstrated the importance of a value system that encourages change, and Williams has shown the importance of the technological aspect of change. Becker has illustrated the dialectical nature of change, whereas Cancian suggests the functional analysis of system prerequisites and maintenance changes. However, the

main contribution of the functionalist approach is that of Merton, who, in addition to establishing a functional methodology, stressed the importance of the concept of strain arising from the dysfunctions of society.

Thus, in spite of the criticisms directed at the functional approach and its inferred emphasis on the static aspect of society, this approach appears to be yielding valuable contributions in the analysis of change.

The contributions of sociologists who adhere to neither the analytical or functional approach is evident in their introduction of various concepts of the change process.

For example, Darendorf, Coser, and Faris have illustrated the relation of social conflict and social disorganization as an originator of change, thereby providing an analytical technique for the determination of the origin of change. The concept of accumulation as advanced by Myrdal and Ogburn serves to show that change often accelerates through its own self generation, and that the time lag between initiation and adoption of innovation can cause stress. Also, the views on the nature of termination of change as propounded by Kaplan suggest possible ends to the change process. The contributions of these sociologists become even more meaningful when placed in the perspective of the conceptual scheme of Etzioni and Etzioni, where change is viewed as occurring through the stages of initiation,

diffusion, and termination.

The suggestions of those authors who used the psychological approach, such as McClelland, Hagen, and LaPiere, demonstrate that individuals with dominant desires for need satisfaction, such as the satisfaction of a high achievement need, can play a major part in the change process.

Thus, contemporary sociological considerations of change have provided the foundation for the analysis of change in the organizational setting, primarily in terms of the conceptualization of social systems. This conceptualization of the social system, of which the organization is one example, holds the nature of change to be the result of the interaction of a number of factors, such as individuals, institutions, and the structure of that social system, as such interaction results in change producing processes, such as dysfunctions, conflict, stress, need satisfaction, and other processes.

In addition, contemporary sociology has developed earlier concepts of the innovative process into the conceptualization of innovation as the process of adapting the social system to changing internal and external requirements.

These individual change factors and their interaction within the systems perspective have formed the basis of current conceptualizations of organization change, although the emphasis

in organizational change has tended towards the study and analysis of the implementation and planning of change, instead of the sociological emphasis on processes of change. The objective of Chapter V is then to illustrate conceptual approaches of organizational theorists to the change function.

CHAPTER V

ORGANIZATIONAL DESIGN AND CHANGE: CONTEMPORARY APPROACHES

Introduction

Generally speaking, contemporary approaches to the analysis of organizational change are similar to sociological approaches to the analysis of social change in that both tend to emphasize the necessity of unified organizational or sociological theory to provide the analytical framework for the analysis of change, but that due to the contemporary incompleteness of such unified theory, both tend to utilize structural-functional analysis of the change process.¹ This similarity is not surprising when the predominance of sociological contributions, through the media of industrial sociology or organizational theory, is considered.²

1 This contemporary emphasis in organizational theory on the need for a unified analytical framework in the study of change, and the lack of empirical validation of such a framework, is suggested by Warren G. Bennis, Changing Organizations: Essays on the Development and Evolution of Human Organization (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1966), pp. 39-41, Harold J. Leavitt, "Applied Organizational Change in Industry", in Handbook of Organizations, ed. by James G. March (Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1965), pp. 1144-1145, Stanford L. Optner, Systems Analysis for Business Management (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1960), p. 19, Ralph M. Stogdill, "Dimensions of Organization Theory", in Approaches to Organizational Design, ed. by James D. Thompson (Pittsburg: University of Pittsburg Press, 1966), pp. 3-6.

2 For one of the better conceptual discussions of sociological contributions to the concept of organizational change, especially those of deviance and conflict, see Stephen Colgrove, The Science of Society (London: George, Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1967), pp. 268-299.

Drawing on the sociological concepts of the social system as attempting to maintain a stable equilibrium in spite of continual internal and external change stimuli, organizational theorists have tended to concentrate on the concept of organizational design, or that organizational structure which would best permit continual change and adaptation by an organization constantly facing uncertainty as a result of its continually changing environment.³

The development of the concept of organizational design and its relationship to change, like the development of sociological considerations of change, has tended to pass through several stages, in that early approaches to organizational change tended to emphasize one aspect of the organizational design, while more recent approaches tend to emphasize the complete design through the utilization of the systems perspectives.⁴

3 This concept of organization design in terms of organizations continually facing uncertainty and the necessity to deal with it, is evident in Bennis, Changing Organizations, R.M. Cyert and J. G. March, A Behavioral Theory of the Firm (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963), and J. D. Thompson, Organizations in Action (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1967), among others. The concept of uncertainty and organizational adaptation thereto will be examined in greater depth in this chapter.

4 This suggestion as to the development of approaches to organizational change is made by Leavitt, "Applied Organizational Change In Industry", pp. 1144-1145, James G. March and Herbert A. Simon, Organizations (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958), pp. 12-33 and Stogdill, "Dimensions of Organization Theory", pp. 39-51.

For example, the early classical organizational theorists tended to focus on organization structure as it could be utilized for the introduction of change, but the emphasis gradually shifted to the importance of technology as a major factor of change.⁵ Subsequently, the emphasis on the individual as a primary change factor within the organizational design became pronounced, and more recently, organizational theorists have tended to consider change as it relates to the complete organizational design, a design which includes previously considered change factors.⁶

The purpose of this chapter is to examine the development of the systems perspective of organizational design through the consideration of structural, technological, actor, and systems approaches to the analysis of organizational change, in order to suggest those aspects of organizational design which are directly related to organizational change.

Structural Approaches

The concentration on that aspect of organizational design which is termed organizational structure, and the view that through the use of general principles of organization such as division of labor, authority structures, etcetera, could organizational performance be optimized was

⁵ Some examples of various discussions holding technology to be of primary importance are: Donald A. Schon, Technology and Change (New York: Delcorte Press, 1967), and Joan Woodward, Industrial Organization: Theory and Practice, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1965). The relationship of technology and change will be examined in greater depth in this chapter.

⁶ See, for example, Thompson, Organizations in Action, pp. 159-162. The concept of organizational design as it includes various single factor theories of change within the systems perspective will form a primary emphasis of the latter part of this chapter.

the predominant theme of the early classical authors of organization theory.⁷

Probably the first to suggest such principles as they related to an ideal concept of organization was the German scholar Max Weber, who emphasized the need for clearly defined responsibilities, authority, and positions within the bureaucratic structure in order to achieve the most effective organizational performance.⁸ Another proponent of the structural approach, although more in terms of managerial functions, was the French administrator Henri Fayol, who postulated five basic elements of the management function such as planning, controlling, commanding, organizing, and co-ordinating.⁹

On the basis of these elements, Fayol suggested certain principles of management related to organizational structure in terms of nonconflicting

7 This is suggested by several authors, among them being: Amitai Etzioni, Modern Organizations (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964), p. 20, Leavitt, "Applied Organizational Change in Industry", p. 1146, and March and Simon, Organizations, p. 12.

8 Weber originally proposed this concept in his work Wirtschaft and Gesellschaft, and his concepts are discussed extensively by many sociologists, one of the better ones being, P. M. Blau and R. W. Scott, Formal Organizations: A Comparative Approach (San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Co., 1962), pp. 27-36.

9 Henri Fayol, General and Industrial Management, trans. by Constance Storrs (London: Pitman, 1949).

chains of command and the relationship of authority and responsibility.¹⁰

A slightly different emphasis of the structural approach is evident in the writings of the American administrator, Chester Barnard, who instead of concentrating on management functions, emphasized that formal organizations have two basic essentials; a purpose, in terms of goals; and a communication process which is necessary to obtain the cooperation of workers towards the achievement of organizational goals.¹¹ Barnard's emphasis on the communication process as it relates to the interactive part of the executive process is one of the earlier attempts to suggest the importance of communication as the linking process, one which facilitates interaction and change, in organizations,¹² a view that

¹⁰ A summarized version of Fayol's concepts emphasizing these aspects is available in: D. S. Pugh, D. J. Hickson, and C. R. Hinings, Writers on Organizations: An Introduction (London: Hutchinson and Co., 1964), pp. 23-25

¹¹ These views of Barnard are developed in his two major works, Chester Barnard, The Functions of the Executive (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1948), and Chester Barnard, Organization and Management (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1948). This view is slightly different than the pure structuralists, one of the better examples of this latter approach being Luther Gulick and L. Urwick, eds., Papers On the Science of Administration (New York: Institute of Public Administration, 1937), which discusses structural factors such as division of labor, departmentalization, coordination of work, and other similar concepts as being of primary importance in organization theory.

¹² The key aspect of the importance of communications in Barnard's organizational perspective is emphasized by Pugh et al Writers on Organizations, pp. 26-30.

is evident in contemporary suggestions as to the importance of communication as part of the organizational design.¹³

Although there were other early structural authors, see, for example, the work of Bakke or Brown,¹⁴ the foregoing illustrative descriptions of some of these early authors serve to highlight their view that organizational efficiency is derived from the optimum organization structure, and hence, the major change variable becomes the structure of that organization.

The structural approach, in terms of primary emphasis, is, as Leavitt notes, still present in much of the contemporary literature dealing with organizational change,¹⁵ one important aspect of which is the continuing dialogue as to the merits of centralization versus decentralization.¹⁶ The more contemporary approaches to change in terms of

13 Some examples of the contemporary emphasis on communication are available in Harold J. Leavitt, Managerial Psychology (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958), pp. 118-128, and William G. Scott, "Organization Theory: An Overview and an Appraisal," in Organizations: Structure and Behavior, ed. by Joseph A. Litterer (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1963), pp. 21-22.

14 E. Wright Bakke, Bonds of Organization (New York: Harper and Bros., 1950); and Wilfred Brown, Exploration in Management (London: Heinemann Educational Books, 1960).

15 Leavitt, "Applied Organizational Change in Industry," p. 1147.

16 Leavitt, "Applied Organizational Change in Industry," p. 1147.

structure tend to examine additional variables and their relationship to structure. For example, the work of authors such as Burns and Stalker and Peterson, is devoted primarily to discussion of particular types of organization design that tend to be more amenable to change.¹⁷ On the other hand, Woodward and Hickson have discussed the influence of differing technological variables on the organization structure,¹⁸ and Gouldner and Chapple and Sayles have utilized an "engineering" approach to structural change.¹⁹

In addition, that aspect of organizational design which refers to structural innovation through communication networks as related to task and structural variables, a design that would appear to have direct application as demonstrated by the work of Chapman et al in military defence systems, has recently received attention.²⁰

17 Tom Burns and G. M. Stalker, The Management of Innovation (London: Tavistock Publications, 1961); and Peter G. Peterson, "Some Approaches to Innovation in Industry" in The Creative Organization ed. by Gary A. Steiner (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965), pp. 183-190.

18 D. J. Hickson, et al, "Operations Technology and Organizational Structure: "An Empirical Re-Appraisal", (Edmonton, Alberta: Unpublished Lecture Notes, Faculty of Business Administration and Commerce, 1969).

19 E. D. Chapple and L. R. Sayles, The Measure of Management (New York: Macmillan, 1961), and A. Gouldner, "Exploration in Organizational Social Science", Social Problems, 3, 173-181.

20 R. L. Chapman et al, "The Systems Research Laboratory's Air Defence Experiments", Management Science, 5, 1959, 250-269. An extensive discussion of communication networks as a part of organizational design is included in Harold Guetzkow, "Communications in Organizations", in Handbook of Organizations, ed. by March, pp. 542-550.

An additional aspect of the structural approach that is being subjected to empirical analysis is that of the comparative analysis of institutions or organizations, an approach that may provide some insight into organizational flexibility.²¹ For example, the research efforts of Pugh et al have resulted in the delineation of different types of bureaucratic structure, but as of yet has not been able to empirically determine differences in terms of organizational flexibility.²²

Another structural approach that is very similar to early sociological studies of social change in terms of the evolution of societies is the historical approach utilized by authors such as Chandler and MacIntosh who have examined the structural growth of large companies

21 Some examples of the recent emphasis on the comparative approach are: S. N. Eisenstadt, Essays on Comparative Institutions (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1965), Amitai Etzioni, A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations (New York: The Free Press, 1960), and William J. Siffin, ed., Toward The Comparative Study of Public Administration (Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 1959). An overview of this topic is provided by Stanley Udy Jr., "The Comparative Analysis of Organizations," in Handbook of Organizations, ed. by March, pp. 678-679. Both Eisenstadt, Essays on Comparative Institutions, pp. 40-44, and Etzioni, A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations, pp. xi-xx, suggest that the comparative study of organizations is neglected and that such study is necessary to provide the "middle range" theories of organization that will allow for the analysis of organizational processes, including that of change.

22 D. D. Pugh, et al, "A Conceptual Scheme For Organizational Analysis," Administrative Science Quarterly", 8, (1963), 289-315. It is interesting to note that this team has been able to quantify and measure structural variables such as formalization, standardization, configuration, concentration of authority, and specialization, but has not yet been able to treat the variable of flexibility in an empirical manner, thereby giving some indication of the inherent difficulty faced when attempting to quantify and measure that aspect of organizational design in terms of change.

in relation to the structural adaptation to external factors such as government, markets, suppliers, etc., over a period of time expressed in decades.²³ The importance of these authors in relation to their contribution is one of providing historical evidence of the nature of change within the organization as resulting from the external environment, a factor which is an important and integral part of a systems perspective of organizational change.

The contemporary view of the role of structure in organizational change has itself changed from the early view that all changes should be introduced through a change in the organizational structure to the view that organizations should be structured in such a manner as to facilitate individual innovation and organizational adaptiveness. This new view, in opposition to the early one of emphasis on heavily bureaucratized structures, arises from the sociological consideration of dysfunctions in bureaucracy and out of the inherent unadaptability of the bureaucratic organization to the constantly changing modern organizational environment.

This contemporary view of the necessity for designing organizational structures in a non bureaucratic manner in order to facilitate change is postulated by Burns and Stalker who suggest their "organismic" structure, which is characterized by a lack of bureaucratic features, is

²³ Alfred D. Chandler, Jr., Strategy and Structure: Chapters In The History of the American Industrial Enterprise (Mass.: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press, 1962), and, A. S. Mackintosh, The Development of Firms (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963).

the only structure which will allow the modern organization to continuously adapt to the changing environment.²⁴ In addition, contemporary views of the necessity to structure the organization in order to allow greater creativity and innovative action on the part of the individual are propounded by authors such as Argyris, Estes, McGregor, and many others, who suggest that not only will the individual who is allowed greater creativity contribute more to the organization, he will at the same time derive greater satisfaction from his own position in the organization.²⁵

In addition, even those writers who still dwell on the structural approach in effect recognize the interdependence of other variables such as the individual and technology within the total system context of the organization.

Technological Approaches

The technological approach to the analysis of change is similar to the structural approach in that both tend to assess the effect of given

24 Burns and Stalker, The Management of Innovation, p. 262.

25 Argyris, Organization and Innovation; Hugh Estes, "Some Considerations in Designing an Organization Structure" in Organization Theory in Industrial Practice, ed. by Mason Haire (New York: Wiley and Sons, 1962), pp. 13-27; and Douglas McGregor, The Human Side of Enterprise (New York: McGraw Hill, 1960). This particular theme will be examined in greater depth in the later discussion of the people approach in this chapter.

factors on the structural aspect of organizational design, but it differs in that primary importance is assigned to the causative aspect of technology as it affects the organizational design. It is not surprising that adherents of this approach tend to view the organization as adapting primarily to changing technology, for the comparatively rapid rate of technological change has been a predominant theme of organizational literature dealing with change, and also of sociological literature considering social change.²⁶

One of the earlier proponents of the technological approach, one which was applied under the guise of scientific management, was that of Frederick Taylor who conceived of extensive use of quantified technological applications as the primary factor in contributing to organizational efficiency.²⁷ In addition, authors such as Meier, Mumford, and Walker, noted the predominance of assembly line techniques of production, which tended to disregard the human factor, and thereby illustrated that organizational design can be directly affected, even moulded, by technology.²⁸

26 This emphasis would appear to be derived from the many discussions of the changing modern society as a result of changing technology, some of which are: F. R. Allen, et al, Technology and Social Change (New York: Appleton-Century Crofts, inc., 1957), and R. T. LaPiere, Social Change (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1965), pp. 253-290.

27 F. W. Taylor, Scientific Management (New York: Harper, 1911). For a review of this concept, see Amitai Etzioni, Modern Organizations (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964), pp. 21-22.

28 The affect of technologic advances such as mass production techniques on organizational design, especially the resulting social ~~and~~ the organizational ~~design~~ being suggested by: R. L. Mier,

Although the technological approach, especially in terms of scientific management, underwent a serious decline in the mid-twentieth century, it is suggested by Leavitt that the recent concentration on operations research and extensive computer usage is in effect a resurgence of this view in that it tends to emphasize technological applications.²⁹ In addition, the work of Walker and Guest in illustrating the dominance of assembly line techniques which tend to be asocial in nature in that they disregard the human factor in their emphasis on technological efficiency, thereby possibly inducing dysfunctional worker behavior, would tend to support Leavitt's contention.³⁰

"Communication and Social Change," Behavioral Sciences, 1, 1956, 43-58, L. Mumford, Technics and Civilization (New York: Harcourt and Brace, 1934), and C. R. Walker, ed., Modern Technology and Civilization (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962).

29 Leavitt, "Applied Organizational Change in Industry," p. 1150.

30 Charles R. Walker and Robert H. Guest, "The Man on the Assembly Line", in Organizations and Human Behavior, A Book of Readings, ed. by Gerald D. Bell (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967), pp. 230-245. For a discussion of some human problems arising from technological change, see Edward H. Spicer, ed. Human Problems in Technological Change: A Casebook (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1952).

In addition, when considering recent applications of advanced technology in terms of process production, especially in the steel and chemical industries, and the extensive use of computer simulation models, both of which tend to emphasize technical efficiency to the detriment of the human factor, it becomes possible to accept Leavitt's contention that these technological applications are only scientific management under another guise.

Of the empirical studies of the effect of changing technological applications in industry, one of the more comprehensive ones is that of Bright, who, in a detailed examination of selected industrial firms who automated production facilities, found that automated production facilities tended to reduce flexibility of the organizational design in its adaptation to changing market conditions.³¹

Bright also suggested that there were several unanticipated consequences of automation, in terms of greater cost and worker inability to adapt or adjust, but he also suggested the possibility that benefits to the worker, in terms of greater income, security, and prestige could result from automation.³²

Another empirical study, carried out by Woodward, suggested that technological means of production affected the organizational design in that she suggested small batch production tended to encourage close interpersonal relationships and reduce conflict, completely automated production processes reduced conflict because control was exercised

31 Bright, Technology and Automation (Harvard: Harvard University Press, 1958).

32 Ibid.

through the impersonal process, but that mass assembly line techniques increased conflict as control was exercised both through the line and through supervisors.³³

In an attempt to relate technology to organization structure, Hickson et al, on the basis of a structural analysis of fifty-two English organizations suggested that size and technology and their interrelationship affected structure.³⁴ They suggested that in smaller firms where management was closely allied to the production process, technology could significantly affect structure, but that in larger firms where management was separated from the production process by several hierarchical levels, technology appeared to not exert a significant influence on organizational design.³⁵

The major problem in approaches to organizational change in terms of technological variables is the same as that incurred in the structural approaches, namely the failure to consider all of the major variables affecting organizational design. The failure to consider one of the major variables within this design, that of the human aspect, has led to the repeated failure of proposed organizational changes, thereby providing ample evidence that the assumption that technology is the major variable within the organizational design is invalid in most cases.³⁶

33 Woodward, Industrial Organization: Theory and Practice.

34 Hickson et al, "Organization Structure and Operations Technology".

35 Ibid.

36 For illustrations of the failure of this approach, see Elton

Thus, to attempt the analysis, planning, or implementation of organizational change within the technological approach which assumes the worker to be a logical rational individual that attempts optimization of personal rewards appears to be invalid, as Schein suggests when he discusses the worker as a "complex man".³⁷ However, the technological approach, especially as espoused by adherents to scientific management, and its successor, operations research, will probably remain an important approach to change. This is due to the fact that it attempts to provide a quantified body of techniques to solve work related problems and as such appeals to management because of its rationality, especially when this approach is compared with the difficulty inherent in quantifying and measuring the human variable or the complete organizational design in terms of change.

The People, or Actor Approach

As is suggested by Leavitt, the people approach to organizational change, which consists of completing organizational change through changing individuals or groups within that organization, has developed through basically two major stages, the manipulative stage, and the power equalization stage.³⁸ This particular actor approach has been the primary

Mayo, The Social Problems of an Industrial Civilization (Boston: Harvard University Press, 1945), or W. F. White, Money and Motivation (New York: Harper and Bros., 1955).

37 Edgar H. Schein, Organizational Psychology (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1965), pp. 60-63.

38 Leavitt, "Applied Organizational Change in Industry", p. 1151.

focus of not only organizational change concepts, but of organization theory in general since the early Hawthorne experiments, and its growth has been enhanced by many contemporary authors such as McGregor, Drucker, Bennis, Guest, and many others.³⁹ In addition, this approach for the first time began to study the change process as an entity, in contrast to earlier structural and technological approaches which were focussed primarily on problem solving techniques that tended to overlook the internal, and especially the informal, aspect of organizational processes.

The manipulative stage of the people approach was an integral part of the human relations approach which consisted primarily of attempting to get people to do what management wishes them to do.⁴⁰

The actor approach is generally considered to have begun with the work of Mayo and others who discovered, in an attempt to change technological factors, that these factors did not appear to affect production, and they therefore concluded that social groups were a significant

39 Bennis et al, The Planning of Change; Bennis, Changing Organizations (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966); Peter F. Drucker, The Effective Executive (New York: Harper and Row, 1966); Robert H. Guest, Organizational Change: The Effect of Successful Leadership (Homewood, Ill.: The Dorsey Press, 1962); and McGregor, The Human Side of Enterprise. The concepts of these authors will be examined in this section.

40 This manipulative aspect is notable in Carnegie, How To Win Friends and Influence People. The human relations aspect is discussed extensively in Amatai Etzioni, Modern Organizations (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1964), pp. 32-41.

factor in worker productivity.⁴¹ In addition, much of the early work in this area was developed in an attempt to overcome resistance to change, one of the examples of this being the work of Lewin in changing food habits, another example being the work of Coch and French in the industrial situation.⁴² Both of these studies suggested that resistance to change could be reduced through the utilization of the method of working through informal worker groups. This whole concept of worker restriction of output and resistance to change is studied extensively by Whyte, who also suggests that worker groups play an important part in setting norms opposed to those of management, and hence, generally resisting change induced by management.⁴³

These studies led to the conclusion expressed by Lewin who suggested that an important method of change was the changing of the standards of the worker group, this concept being a very important aspect of the people approach to organizational change.⁴⁴

41 Elton Mayo, The Social Problems of an Industrial Civilization (Boston: Harvard University Grad. School of Business, 1945).

42 K. Lewin, "Group Decision and Social Change", in G. E. Swanson et al, eds., Readings in Social Psychology. 2nd ed. (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1952), pp. 459-473. L. Coch, and J. R. French, "Overcoming Resistance to Change," Human Relations, 1948, 1, 512-513.

43 Whyte, Money and Motivation.

44 Lewin, "Group Decision and Social Change," p. 472.

The manipulative aspect of the human relations school, and other criticisms thereof in terms of overconcentration on the one variable of human interaction,⁴⁵ led to a reaction on the part of many authors who began to suggest that the human relations approach failed to consider a key variable, that of power, and that therefore a true people approach to change would involve a transfer of power to the worker in the change relationship.⁴⁶

Thus, the key element in the later state of the people approach is what Leavitt has termed power-equalization wherein change in organizations is introduced through collaborative techniques in which is inherent the concept that at least equal power in the change process is allocated to the individual or group that is being changed or is involved in the change process.⁴⁷

45 This manipulative approach and its drawbacks are noted by Leavitt, "Applied Organizational Change in Industry," p. 1152. In addition, there is an extensive critique of the human relations approach in Etzioni, Modern Organizations, pp. 44-49.

46 This suggestion is made by Leavitt, "Applied Organizational Change in Industry," p. 1153, and is an assumed concept in Bennis, et al, eds., The Planning of Change, and Bennis, Changing Organizations, especially part two of the latter.

47 Leavitt, "Applied Organizational Change in Industry," p. 1153.

The techniques of the actor approach through power-equalization then rest primarily on the concept of self imposed and collaborative change, thus the human relations or technological approaches in terms of coercive or inducive change no longer remain applicable, and recent techniques are much more people orientated, as illustrated in their emphasis on individual motivation and participation in organizational processes.⁴⁸

The basic theme of the power-equalization technique revolves around the use of a change agent who acts in a permissive, supportive, and non-directive role much similar to that of a counselor.⁴⁹ Some examples of this basic theme include; the use of client centered therapy as advanced by Rogers,⁵⁰ applied group dynamics as utilized by Miles,⁵¹ and T-Group training as described by Bennis.⁵² The most important of

⁴⁸ This people orientation is discussed extensively in Dahl et al, Social Science Research on Business, pp. 66-90 .

⁴⁹ This theme is emphasized in Leavitt, "Applied Organizational Change in Industry," p. 1153, and is emphasized also in Bennis, Changing Organizations, p. 131.

⁵⁰ C. R. Rogers, Client Centered Therapy (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1951).

⁵¹ M. B. Miles, Learning How To Work in Groups, (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1959).

⁵² Bennis, Changing Organizations, pp. 131-166.

these techniques is the T-Group, which utilizes group leaders who attempt to change group behavior through permissive and nonauthoritarian activity on the part of the leader, although this leader in this manner presumably encourages group members to discuss and solve their own problems, resulting in changed attitudes.⁵³

The emergence of this people approach to organizational change has been allied with, and in some cases, has provided the foundation for, several new concepts of management that are basically related to the individual in the organization acting in the role of an innovator.

In order to illustrate this contention, it is suggested that the peoples approach has arisen out of the results of two applied concepts, those of dysfunctions of bureaucracy, and a revised motivational view of the nature of employee needs and need satisfaction.⁵⁴

In addition, many of the recent concepts of management such as those related to leadership, participation, management by objectives, role, conflict, and communications appear to be a direct result of this heavy orientation on the individual or the individual in groups in the change process.

53 This basic role of the leader is noted in Leavitt, "Applied Organizational Change in Industry", p. 1153, and is discussed in Bennis, Changing Organizations, pp. 113-130.

54 For example, Argyris discusses extensively the fulfilment of human needs in Argyris, Interpersonal Competence and Organizational Effectiveness (Homewood, Ill.: Richard Irwin, 1962). In addition, a summarized review of dysfunctions in bureaucracy is available in March and Simon, "Dysfunctions in Organizations" in Organizations and Human Behavior, ed. by Bell, pp. 91-96.

The basic premise of dysfunction in organizations, especially in relation to dysfunctions of the bureaucratic model, as summarized by March and Simon, are primarily in terms of the lack of individual activity within the organization, i.e., the individual is unable to exhibit innovative and satisfying activity within the rules and regulations of the organization.⁵⁵ These aspects of the reaction to bureaucracy as the most important form of organization in terms of efficiency has led some authors to suggest that it is possible that less rigid forms or organization allow for individual innovative action, and may in fact be more efficient, especially when efficiency is considered in terms of adaptability to changing external conditions of the organization.⁵⁶

55 This is suggested in March and Simon, Organizations, pp. 36-37. The original studies on which March and Simon's conclusions are based are: A. W. Gouldner, Patterns Of Industrial Bureaucracy (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1954); Robert K. Merton, "Bureaucratic Structure and Personality," in Reader in Bureaucracy, ed. by Merton, et al (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1952), pp. 361-371; and P. Selznick, T.V.A. and The Grass Roots, (Berkley: Berkley Univ. Press, 1949).

56 This suggestion is made by March and Simon "Dysfunctions In Organizations," p. 91 through inference in that they note the dysfunctions of organizations can reduce efficiency from the rationality subscribed to by Weber. This concept of efficiency in terms of adaptability will be examined as an integral part of the systems approach later in this chapter.

A closely related topic or concept to that of dysfunction in organizations is that of a revised motivational view of the nature of man's needs, arising primarily out of the hierarchial classification of needs as developed by Maslow.⁵⁷ In his postulation, Maslow conceived of the needs of humanity, in terms of the individual, as consisting of lower order needs of a physical nature, rising to the higher order needs of an ego or self satisfaction activity.

This particular concept of motivation, that man seeks self satisfaction in the work place, forms the underlying assumption of much of recent people orientation in the area of change in that the individual is becoming an entity in the change process because innovative action on his part, allowed by lack of bureaucratic restrictions, not only results in adaption of the organization but also in fulfilment of the individual's higher order needs of self satisfaction.⁵⁸

In order to illustrate this aspect of the individual as an innovative process in satisfying his own needs, some examples of recent management applications based on this concept will be discussed.

57 A. Maslow, Motivation and Personality (New York: Harper and Bros., 1954), pp. 80-106. A summarized discussion of Maslow's concept of higher order needs in terms of ego-relevant needs is included in Arnold S. Tannenbaum, Social Psychology of the Work Organization (London: Tavistock Pubs.), p. 28.

58 The relationship of Maslow's concept of higher order needs to the industrial situation is discussed in Schein, Organizational Psychology, pp. 57-57. In addition, the work of McGregor, The Human Side of Enterprize, and Argyris, Integrating the Individual and the Organization (New York: Wiley, 1964) both reflect a heavy emphasis on the organization as it should be fulfilling higher order needs in terms of self satisfaction.

One of the key recent management concepts that demonstrates this view of the individual is that relating to the setting of organizational goals, and, on a lower hierarchial level, the allied concept currently in vogue, that of management by objectives.⁵⁹ The goal setting process in the people approach emphasizes the collaborative aspect of the determination of organizational goals in that the individual has a direct input to the establishment of these goals.⁶⁰ The process of management by objectives is very similar in that it involves the joint-goal setting by superior and subordinate, thus producing quantitative objectives in which not only can performance be appraised, but also producing greater satisfaction on the part of the subordinate because of his participation in the establishment of goals.⁶¹

Indeed, the whole concept of participative management is a direct outgrowth of the actor orientation in that being based on the premise that individuals tend to support those activities in which they have influence in creation, it not only emphasizes the individual as a

59 Leavitt, "Applied Organizational Change in Industry," p. 1161.

60 For a comprehensive discussion, in summarized form, of various methods of goal determination, see Etzioni, Modern Organizations, pp. 5-19.

61 For a comprehensive review of the concept of management by objectives, see K. T. Hepburn, Management by Objectives: A Behavioral Perspective, (Unpublished M.B.A. Thesis, U of A, 1968).

creative and affective element in the changing organization, but at the same time it increases his satisfaction as a result of his innovative position.⁶²

Another important aspect of the peoples approach is the revised concept of communication which is regarded in terms of supplying feedback which allows continual readjustment and adaptation on the part of management.⁶³ In addition, Leavitt suggests that organizational change takes place more readily where communication facilitates two-way interaction, where ample communication channels are available, and where communication is valid.⁶⁴

In addition, recent concepts of leadership as that innovative activity on the part of the individual that is not routine, or the view that leadership only occurs where innovative activity beyond routine administration is carried out by the individual, infers the position of a leader as one involved in truly innovative activities.⁶⁵

⁶² One of the foremost proponents of this approach is McGregor, The Human Side of Management.

⁶³ Litterer, Organizations: Structure and Behavior, pp. 21-22, and P. B. Applewhite, Organizational Behavior (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1965), pp. 96-97.

⁶⁴ Leavitt, "Applied Organizational Change in Industry," p. 1162.

⁶⁵ D. Katz and R. L. Kahn, The Social Psychology of Organizations (New York: Wiley and Sons, 1966), p. 308.

One of the more outstanding examples of the prevalence of the people approach is the recent emphasis on the concept of role.⁶⁶ This concentration on the individual as one who has certain perceptions of his role and who is subject to the perceptions of others in relation to his role gives rise to the concept of role conflict which is that conflict which arises through differing role perceptions, and which may give rise to innovative behavior by the individual in order to reduce the apparent conflict.⁶⁷

A final concept which, in relation to the peoples approach to organizational change, takes on a slightly different context than that usually accorded it is that of decision-making. As Leavitt notes, the decision making process in this approach refers primarily to the normative issue of achieving agreement in that, rather than achieving the optimal solution through rational, cognitive process, it becomes one of achieving the most valid consensus among members on the basis that such consensus will precede effective implementation of the decision.⁶⁸

66 For example, D. J. Hickson, "A Convergence in Organization Theory" Administrative Science Quarterly, 11, (Sept. 1966) 224-237 suggests a convergence of organization theory in terms of role specificity.

67 Of the many discussions of role conflict, one of the better ones, in that it relates it to change, is that of Katz and Kahn, The Social Psychology of Organizations, pp. 197-198.

68 Leavitt, "Applied Organizational Change in Industry," p. 1165.

This people, or actor approach is evident in the considerations of organizational change by several authors prominent in the field of organization theory. For example, Blake and Mouton, in their Managerial Grid have suggested that team management is in effect an optimal integration of individual concern for relationships and organizational achievement of task, thus achieving continuous adaptation.⁶⁹ In addition, Tannenbaum had argued for the distribution of the exercise of control on the basis it causes a sense of involvement in the organization.⁷⁰ Blau and Scott conclude that change occurs in terms of dialectics in that the solutions of individuals to one set of problems in the organization give rise to a new set of problems requiring solution, and thusly the organization is in a continual state of change.⁷¹

Another interesting explanation of the change process was advanced by Michels who conceived of the "Iron Law of Oligarchy" wherein leaders, even in organizations such as unions which were formed to change an environment, tended to compromise organizational goals with the very

69 R. R. Blake and J. S. Mouton, The Managerial Grid (Houston, Texas: Gulf, 1964).

70 A. S. Tannenbaum, "Control in Organizations," Administrative Science Quarterly, 7, (1962), 236-257.

71 Blau and Scott, Formal Organizations, pp. 250-253.

environment that was to be changed, and in this manner they were able to perpetuate their leadership positions.⁷²

A very heavy stress on the role of the businessman as an innovator in order to fulfill his need for achievement has been advanced by McClelland, who extrapolates the strong achievement motivation of a nation to the point where it becomes a primary factor in the progress of nations.⁷³

The concept of rational choice in the initiation of change has been advocated by March and Simon who suggest that the rational choice of activities necessary to achieve changed organizational goals will proceed in three stages.⁷⁴ They suggest that the individual will tend to consider first those variables under his control, secondly, to consider those variables which are not directly under his control, and finally, the individual's attention will be directed to the criteria the program must satisfy in an effort to amend the criteria.⁷⁵

72 R. Michels, Political Parties (Clencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1949)

73 David C. McClelland, "Business Drive and National Achievement", in Organizations and Human Behavior, ed. by Bell, pp. 185-198, see Chapter III for a discussion of McClelland's concept of the achievement motive.

74 March and Simon, Organizations, pp. 172-210.

75 Ibid. pp. 179-180.

Much of the more recent literature dealing with the people approach has tended to shift in emphasis from what is being changed to discussions of how change is implemented, or the methods whereby change is introduced.⁷⁶

For example, the heavy involvement of social scientists in change in organizations, especially as participants in the design, planning, and implementation of change, has been emphasized by Bennis in his discussion of the concept of change agents.⁷⁷ He defines a change agent as typically a behavioral scientist who collaborates with the client system, which is the target of change, in an attempt to apply valid knowledge to the client system's problems.⁷⁸ In recognition of the primary emphasis of the change agent approach on only one method of change, that of the collaborative process, Bennis has constructed a typology of seven other change styles which are differentiated among, and based on, power distribution, goal setting, and change implementation.⁷⁹

76 This is suggested by Louis B. Barnes, "Approaches To Organizational Change", in Bennis et al, The Planning of Change, 2nd ed., pp. 79-84.

77 Bennis, Changing Organizations, pp. 113-119.

78 Ibid., p. 82.

79 Ibid., pp. 83-84. For a discussion of earlier types of change programs such as elite-corps programs, human relations training, etcetera, and a critique thereof, see Bennis, Changing Organizations, pp. 101-108.

These typologies cover: indoctrination change, where goal setting is mutual but under unilateral power; coercive change, which involves unilateral power employing mutual goal setting with deliberate intentions, as in brainwashing; technocratic change, which involves unilateral goal setting with shared power of implementation; interactional change, where power is shared without active seeking of goals; socialization change, where goal setting is unilateral but implementation is shared, as in the case of the child within the family unit; emulative change, where there is unilateral power without goals; and a residual category termed natural change where power is shared but where there is no deliberate goal setting, as in the case of change due to accidents or unintended events.⁸⁰

The importance of this approach of Bennis is that the initiation of change through the use of various types of power distribution may be more important than other change variables in determining the outcome of change, in that the method of change may of itself determine the outcome.

The emphasis on the actor approach is evident in the work of Greiner, who after searching the literature on organizational change identified the most commonly used approaches as follows:⁸¹ the decree

⁸⁰ For a discussion of this typology see Barnes, "Approaches To Organizational Change", pp. 81-82.

⁸¹ L. E. Greiner, "Organizational Change And Development", (Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Harvard University, 1965). These approaches are discussed also in Barnes, "Approaches To Organizational Change", pp. 82-83.

approach, which consists of a one-way announcement of proposed change from an individual in a high authority position;⁸² the replacement approach, where individuals in key positions are replaced;⁸³ the structural approach, where the relationships of workers are changed, thereby theoretically changing their behavior;⁸⁴ the group decision approach, which involves participation by group members in decision and change implementation;⁸⁵ the data discussion approach, where relevant data is prepared and fed back to the client system by a change agent;⁸⁶ the group problem solving approach, wherein the problem is identified and discussed by a group headed by an outsider;⁸⁷ and the T-Group approach, which involves

82 This approach is evident in F. W. Taylor, The Principles and Methods of Scientific Management (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1911), and in A. Gouldner, Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy (New York: The Free Press, 1964).

83 The replacement approach has been examined through case studies by several authors, two of the better being, Gouldner, Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy, and Guest, Organizational Change.

84 This approach is especially evident in the work of Burns and Staulker, The Management of Innovation, wherein they suggest worker relationships can be structured in such a manner as to encourage innovation and adaptation.

85 The validity of this approach is suggested by the work of Lewin, "Group Decision and Social Change", wherein he successfully changed individual food habits by this approach.

86 This approach is illustrated in K. Andrews, "Executive Training by The Case Method", in Human Relations and Administration, The Case Method of Training (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1953).

87 See, for example, C. Sofer, Organization From Within (London: Tabistock Publications, 1961).

training in sensitivity to the processes of individual and group behavior, this training theoretically resulting in changes in interpersonal relationships.⁸⁸

These seven approaches to the implementation of change tend to emphasize the power equalization approach, an emphasis that in applied management appears to be increasing.⁸⁹ Leavitt suggests that one reason for this increased emphasis is that sources of power in modern industry are tending to be derived from knowledge, achievement, or professional qualifications, therefore the formal status role, which was the traditional source of power, tends to be overshadowed.⁹⁰

In spite of the fact that the actor approach has been the primary focus of organizational change literature in recent publications, it still has not, as Leavitt points out, been able to be operative in cases where there is a divergency of organizational and actor goals, thereby inducing conflict and reducing the effectiveness of this approach.⁹¹

88 This approach is discussed extensively by Bennis, Changing Organizations, pp. 131-165.

89 This increased emphasis is suggested by Barnes, "Approaches to Organizational Change", p. 83, and in addition, McGregor, The Human Side of Enterprise, and R. L. Likert, New Patterns of Management (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961) suggest that T-Group training is even supplanting earlier less power sharing approaches.

90 Leavitt, "Applied Organizational Change in Industry", p. 1153.

91 Ibid., p. 1158. This author also suggests that proponents of the actor approach tend to generalize too extensively on the basis of non validated concepts.

In addition, the actor approach, like the structural and technological approaches, tend to emphasize one primary aspect of organizational design as it relates to change, a drawback which the systems perspective, which considers a number of interactive factors in the change process, attempts to overcome.

The Systems Perspective

Prior to giving some examples of the systems approach and its relationship to organizational change by outlining some of the more prominent authors who have suggested modular or systems concepts, it is necessary to establish certain basic concepts of the systems approach that are particularly relevant to the change process.

One of the best descriptions of some of these basic concepts of systems theory is that provided by Haberstroh in that it advances no particular system but attempts to describe components applicable to all systems.⁹² As Haberstroh notes, two of the basic concepts of systems theory derive from the organizational ability to deal with the dual concepts of control and innovation.⁹³ Control refers to the prevention of dysfunctional variations in some aspect of organizational behavior,

92 Chadwick J. Haberstroh, "Organization Design and Systems Analysis," in Handbook of Organizations, ed. by March, pp. 1171-1211.

93 Ibid., p. 1171

whereas innovation has the aim of inducing functional change so that the organization can adapt to internal and environmental pressure, with the added aspect that innovation may consist of altering the control process.

In addition, Haberstroh notes that systems analysis is dynamic in that it is concerned with the behavior of objects as they change over time, and it is pragmatic in that it is concerned with how a task or function, i.e., change, can be or is performed.⁹⁴

The classic conceptualization of Barnard as to effectiveness and efficiency is central to systems design.⁹⁵ He refers to effectiveness in terms of attainment of the formal objectives of the organization, whereas efficiency is in terms of the maintenance of cooperation in the social system, the interrelationship being that efficiency is necessary prior to effectiveness because organizational goals cannot be achieved in an atmosphere of non coordination.

The system itself is conceptualized as being integrated into a larger system, and being characterized by inputs which are transformed within the system and are released in terms of output to other systems.⁹⁶ In addition, the relationship of a system to its environment produces

94 Ibid., p. 1172

95 Barnard, The Functions of The Executive.

96 Haberstroh, "Organization Design and Systems Analysis, p. 1174.

two alternatives, one where there is no reaction to the environment, which is termed a closed system, and the other referring to the system which has constant and important reaction with the environment, which is termed an open system.⁹⁷ The very nature of an organization subject to environmental pressure automatically assumes it to be an open system, and therefore closed system analysis will not enter into this discussion of organizational analysis.

The final key concept is that of the information feed-back system, often termed the communications network, which is the basic process of transmitting data within the system and external to the system, although it is usually referred to as internal to the system.⁹⁸

These basic concepts form a conceptualized view of a system as receiving input from the environment, acting on the input through its internal control, innovative, and information processes, transforming the input to an output acceptable to an external environment, and the system being measured in terms of efficiency necessary to achieve effectiveness, this conceptualization inferring continual change through adaptation.

97 Ibid., p. 1174

98 Ibid., pp. 1175-1177.

The systems perspective is utilized by various authors in two similar, although divergent manners in that some concentrate on the model building aspect in an attempt to operationalize and explain processes, whereas others theoretize as to the system operation without attempting operational validation.⁹⁹ In effect, however, this distinction, i.e., that models are based on techniques of evaluation, whereas systems analysis in total is more of a theoretical conceptualization, does not prove valid in that various authors tend to use the word model and system interchangeably.¹⁰⁰ In order to obviate this classification problem, this examination of models and systems will classify each in the same manner that the author himself has utilized.

In that it was one of the first relatively widely accepted social system models, this discussion will commence with the work of George Homans, who in The Human Group, developed a model of group behavior based on four variables, activity, interaction, sentiment, and norms.¹⁰¹

99 This distinction between models and systems is made by Haberstroh, "Organization Design and Systems Analysis," p. 1173, and is based on the similar distinction made in the field of computer usage.

100 One of the better examples of this confusion of terminology is evident in Theodore Caplow, Principles of Organization (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1964), pp. 90-118, wherein the author lumps the Parsonian concept of general systems theory in with other analytical models.

101 George Casper Homans, The Human Group (New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, 1950).

He postulated that any social system exists within a three-part environment, i.e., physical, cultural, and technological, which specifies certain activities, interactions, and sentiments for members of that system, these being termed the external system. In addition, the dynamic aspect of this model arises from the concept that increasing interaction results in new sentiments not necessarily sanctioned by the external system, producing an internal system which is exemplified in worker pastimes and games not sanctioned by the environment.

This dynamic aspect is further illustrated by the suggestion that internal and external systems are mutually dependent, and further, that these two systems and the environment are also mutually dependent, thus a change in any one of the three aspects results in change in one or more of the others, and such change ultimately forms a cycle in that it returns and causes change in the originating aspect.¹⁰² The key importance of this model is its explicit recognition of the various mutual dependencies, thus making it possible to analyse and anticipate the consequence of change.¹⁰³

102 A summarized version of Homan's model is available in either Schein, Organizational Psychology, pp. 91-92; or, Caplow, Principles of Organization, pp. 1797.

103 This is suggested by Schein, Organizational Psychology, p. 92.

Building on Homan's concept of model interaction within the internal system, Simon suggests an equilibrium concept which conceives of two types of equilibrium, stable and unstable.¹⁰⁴ Simon suggests that participants in the organization receive inducements for which they in turn make certain contributions to the organization, and stable equilibrium occurs when inducements are equal to contributions, but where these are imbalanced, an unstable equilibrium results, tending to result in change in undirected and uncontrolled manners.¹⁰⁵

Another author who has utilized Homan's basic model is Likert, who conceptualizes organizations as systems of interlocking groups, these groups being connected by individuals who occupy key positions of dual group membership.¹⁰⁶ In extrapolating this view, organizations can be viewed as being part of a large scale organization, and in turn it has subsystems which are linked by key people occupying positions in more than one of these areas.¹⁰⁷ The implication in terms of the change process

104 This concept was originally proposed in Herbert A. Simon, "A Formal Theory of Interaction in Social Groups," American Sociological Review, Vol XVII, 2, (April, 1952), but the concept of inducement and contribution are outlined in March and Simon, Organizations, pp. 84-90.

105 This suggestion is made by Caplow, Principles of Organization, pp. 101-102.

106 Likert, New Patterns of Management.

107 This aspect is emphasized in Schein, Organizational Psychology, p. 93.

is that changes should be introduced through these linking individuals, and furthermore, that communication feedback should be through these positions.

Kahn et al have suggested that Likert's overlapping group model fails to recognize distinctions between formal and informal groups, and because of this they have suggested their overlapping role-set model.¹⁰⁸ This model rests on the premise that an individual occupying an office exhibits certain behavior which is termed his role, and furthermore, that this individual is role-related to others such as peers, subordinates, superiors, etc. who in total form his role set, i.e., those other roles with which he interacts.

This basic premise allows the analysis of members of the organization in terms of role conflict, where differing perceptions of the focal role are held by members of the role set, or role ambiguity, where members of the role set fail to communicate the necessary information to the focal role.¹⁰⁹ As Schein suggests, the relationship of this particular model to organizational dynamics is in emphasizing the importance of the interdependence of individuals occupying different roles.¹¹⁰

108 R. L. Kahn et al, Organizational Stress: Studies in Role Conflict and Ambiguity (New York: Wiley, 1964).

109 Ibid., Katz and Kahn have amplified this concept in their Social Psychology of Organizations, an amplification that will be examined later.

110 Schein, Organizational Psychology, p. 95.

These illustrations of the most commonly accepted models utilized in recent organizational theory show that these authors have basically utilized the systems concept, but in most cases they have attempted to use concepts that can be operationally validated, and which serve as the basis of empirical studies.

Prior to considering the systems perspectives as presented by a few authors, it is interesting to note one more approach which the author labels as a model, but which in fact is little more than a derivation from some of the early sociological considerations of change. This modular approach is that of Thompson, who suggests that innovation in an organization occurs in three stages, the conception of change, the proposing of the change, and the implementation of the change,¹¹¹ an approach that seems little different than that of Tarde who originally suggested the innovation-adaption concept.

Although these foregoing examples of some of the major approaches to the organization in terms of model construction have formed a major contribution to the analysis of organizational change, their primary lack is their emphasis on a few aspects of the organization, i.e., Kahn and overlapping roles, Likert and linking pins without examining

¹¹¹ J. D. Thompson, "Innovation in Organizations: Notes Toward a Theory," in Approaches to Organizational Design, ed. by J. D. Thompson (Pittsburg: Pittsburg University Press, 1966), pp. 193-218.

all aspects of the organization. In order to obtain a comprehensive view of the dynamic aspect of the organization, it becomes necessary to turn to what is referred to as general systems theory, and to examine firstly the concept of organization as propounded by the recognized leader of general systems theory, Talcott Parsons.¹¹²

Parsons has adapted his general systems theory, discussed in the previous chapter, to make it applicable to industrial enterprises, in the following manner.¹¹³ His basic concept that all social systems must solve four basic problems, those of adaptation, goal achievement, integration, and latency, forms the basis of his view of the formal organization as a social system that must possess its own set of sub-systems which are concerned with the solution of these four main problems.¹¹⁴ In order to relate the formal organization to other systems, Parsons

112 For one of the better and more recent discussions of general systems theory and the open systems concept, see Katz and Kahn, The Social Psychology of Organizations, pp. 1-70.

113 Parsons, Structure and Process in Modern Societies, pp. 16-96.

114 One of Parson's better explanations of these basic problems is in Parsons et al., Working Papers In The Theory of Action, (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1953), pp. 183-186.

suggests that each organization has as the top level the institutional level, for example, the board of directors, this level's concern being with the latency problem and the maintenance of contact with wider social systems. In addition, Parsons suggests the second level within the organization is the managerial one, which by coordinating and mediating between various subsystems copes with the integrative problem. Finally, he suggests that there is a third level in the organization, a technical one, which meets the problems of adaptation and goal attainment by concentration on the product of the organization.¹¹⁵

Criticism has been directed at Parsons on the basis that his extremely abstract conceptions provide no set of propositions capable of empirical validation,¹¹⁶ but he is supported by Katz and Kahn on the basis that his scheme is one of the few comprehensive views of the interaction of the organization as an entity,¹¹⁷ and Parsons himself has suggested some theoretical propositions implied by his concept.¹¹⁸

115 This summarized view of Parson's concept of the levels of the organization is in Blau and Scott, Formal Organizations, p. 39.

116 Blau and Scott, Formal Organizations, p. 40.

117 These authors suggest that previous concepts of organizations are insufficient in that they do not cover the dynamic aspect of the organization, but that systems theory, in that it emphasizes the dynamic aspect, is more applicable for the analysis of organizations, in Katz and Kahn, The Social Psychology of Organizations, p. 13.

118 Talcott Parsons, "Pattern Variables Revisited," American Sociological Review, 25, (May-June, 1960), pp. 481-482.

One of the most important problems of the Parsonian concept of the social system, at least in relation to organizational change, is that while it emphasizes the dynamic and interactive nature of the system undergoing continuous change, it does not provide for an analysis of the actual change process, a problem that Parsons recognizes when he notes that the present state of knowledge does not allow for the analysis of the change process.¹¹⁹

This particular problem appears to reflect the contemporary view of organizational change in that whereas classical considerations of change are inadequate because they tend to focus on static situations, and modular approaches tend to concentrate on particular aspects of change and as such are not sufficient, systems perspectives, although the closest to the actual dynamic state of the organization, are also inadequate in that they do not yet provide a complete analysis of the change process.

Thus, more contemporary approaches in terms of the systems perspective, although relying heavily on the Parsonian concept of general systems theory, tend to be less abstract and more suitable for empirical usage in terms of analysis of the change process, as is exemplified in

119 Talcott Parsons, The Social System (Glencoe, Ill: The Free Press, 1951), p. 535.

the work of Carzo and Yanouzas, Katz and Kahn, and Seiler, who will be utilized as examples to illustrate this trend to less abstraction of systems theory.¹²⁰

Carzo and Yanouzas postulate that change occurs when a disturbance is interjected that is of sufficient magnitude that internal system forces are unable to return the system to the former steady state, resulting in a new state of the system that has involved a significant difference from previously established patterns of behavior.¹²¹ In addition, they note that the interdependence of system parts is such that change not only affects individual behavior but it reverberates throughout the organization causing subsequent changes. This suggestion concurs with the dialectical nature of change as suggested by Blau and Scott.¹²²

The change of an organization, as Carzo and Yanouzas suggest, from one steady state to another, may be introduced by changing organizational variables, i.e., structure, management techniques, technology, or others, or it may be an unintended result, in terms of dialectics, of consciously introduced change. These authors also point out that a change

120 Rocco Carzo, Jr. and John N. Yanouzas, Formal Organization; A Systems Approach (Homewood, Ill.: Richard D. Irwin, 1967); Katz and Kahn, The Social Psychology of Organizations; and Seiler, Systems Analysis in Organizational Behavior.

121 Carzo and Yanouzas, Formal Organization; A Systems Approach, pp. 500-523.

122 Blau and Scott, Formal Organizations, p. 250.

in one part of the organization does not always result in change in another because the original change may be counteracted by responses from other organizational parts that surpresses its effect in that part.

After stressing the importance of linking the technical and social subsystems by ensuring that both are considered when introducing change in one, these authors suggest that in order for a variable to induce effective change it must:¹²³

- 1 Have the support of power elements, i.e., be legitimized.
- 2 Provide arrangements which allow affected individuals to control as much as possible of their own work activities.
- 3 Allow organization members to participate in the discussion and decision required to implement change.
- 4 Provide a new organizational framework which satisfies the social and psychological needs of members adequately, as well as meeting the material needs of the organization.

Katz and Kahn, building on their proposition that the organization has two main subsystems, termed social and technical, suggest that the major target of change should be improving the goodness of fit between these two subsystems.¹²⁴ They suggest that although organizations

123 Carzo and Yanouzas, Formal Organization, p. 523.

124 In that these authors emphasize the open system concept in their book, The Social Psychology of Organizations, there are continuous references to organizational dynamics throughout, however, the major discussion of change is in pp. 390-451.

are in a continual state of flux, major change, which is referred to as significantly different patterns of behavior, occurs relatively infrequently, and can be attributed to changed inputs from the environment and internal system strain or imbalance.¹²⁵

They suggest that changed inputs can be either of a technical nature, or of a maintenance nature, this latter referring to values and motivations of organization members which makes up the social subsystem. They also refer to internal strain or imbalance as of two kinds, horizontal strain which is a result of competition between different functional subsystems, and vertical strain which is a result of competition between various levels of the hierarchy for power, prestige, or other organizational rewards. They further suggest that changed inputs of various kinds are the most important sources of organizational change.¹²⁶

This particular viewpoint of Katz and Kahn, which they term as systematic change, is a result of their dismissal of several other approaches to planned change which tend primarily to attempt to initiate change through changing individual or group behavior, an approach which they feel is not cognizant of all variables of change.¹²⁷

Another approach utilizing the systems design is that of Seiler, who although not concerned with the problem of organizational change

125 Ibid., p. 446

126 Ibid., p. 451

127 Ibid., p. 451

specifically, has provided a system design based on the premise that "organizational behavior can be most adequately thought of as occurring in a system of interdependent forces, each of which can be analyzed and set in the perspective of other forces".¹²⁸ It is Seiler's contention that his analytical scheme can be utilized in the analysis of organizational process and behavior in that it provides a structuring of variables which have the greatest effect on organizations.¹²⁹

Seiler conceptualizes the organizational system as having certain inputs, in terms of human, technological, organizational, and social aspects, these inputs through interaction resulting in actual behavior or organization members in terms of their activities, interactions, and sentiments. This author then suggests this actual behavior can be assessed in terms of outputs, which are referred to as productivity, satisfaction, and development.¹³⁰

The implication of this design for the analysis of organizational change is in terms of what Katz and Kahn refer to as "manipulation of organizational variables" in that by holding all but one variable constant,

128 Seiler, Systems Analysis In Organizational Behavior, p. xiv.

129 Ibid.

130 Although this design forms the basis for the whole of Seiler's book, he summarizes the system in Systems Analysis, p. 33.

and varying this one, the assessment of change can be traced through individual behavior as exhibited by the type of output.¹³¹

In addition to these foregoing authors who have either utilized the systems approach in the analysis of change or have provided a framework for the analysis of change, there are several other authors who have adopted the systems perspective but tend to emphasize one particular aspect in relation to organization change.

For example, Bennis in a recent publication has continued his concentration on the peoples approach in that he emphasizes the role of the change agent and discusses several methods utilized in changing individual behavior patterns.¹³²

Another example of the systems perspective emphasizing particular aspects is that of Hampton et al which is similar to many texts written primarily for management in that it emphasizes the planning and implementation of change through direct managerial action, through authority and strategy, and finally changes resulting from modification in structure.¹³³ In addition, Litterer has attempted an analysis of the

131 Katz and Kahn, The Social Psychology of Organizations, p. 451.

132 Bennis, Changing Organizations, pp. 113-166.

133 Hampton et al, Organizational Behavior and The Practice of Management, pp. 494-660. A summary of these approaches is provided on p. 654.

change process within the organization system in terms of role conflict derived from differences in formal task role and self-concept of his role, thereby producing strain which the individual attempts to reduce through adaptive behavior.¹³⁴

Another author, Longenecker, has noted the importance of considering the organization as a social system,¹³⁵ but in his discussion of the process of change he concentrates on the need for organization planning to ensure smooth adaptation of the organization in order to prevent violation of individual values and in order to achieve organizational goals, without attempting an analysis of the change process.¹³⁶

The importance of the organization as a complex system reacting to the social environment is discussed by Etzioni, wherein he attempts to discuss the relationship of society and the environment to the modern industrial enterprise.¹³⁷

134 Litterer, the Analysis of Organizations, pp. 443-460.

135 Longenecker, Principles of Management and Organizational Behavior, pp. 292-307.

136 Ibid., pp. 252-271.

137 Etzioni, Modern Organizations, pp. 105-116.

This view of the complex organization as reacting to a changing environment has been developed by Thompson, who conceptualizes an organization as systems of roles and relationships which face the primary problem of dealing with uncertainty, this uncertainty occurring in inputs, throughputs, and outputs.¹³⁸ Cyert and March also emphasize the concept of an organization as a system for dealing with uncertainty, and suggest that since organizations are systems for dealing with uncertainty, their primary need is the ability to cope with uncertainty.¹³⁹

Therefore, the basic problem of organizations which arises from the need to cope with uncertainty is the development of that organizational design which best achieves the basic function of coping with uncertainty. In attempting to relate the concept of power to uncertainty, Crozier has suggested that those aspects of the organizational design which cope most effectively with uncertainty should exert the most relative power within that organization.¹⁴⁰

138 J. D. Thompson, Organizations in Action (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967), p. 159.

139 R. M. Cyert and J. G. March, A Behavioral Theory Of The Firm (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963), p.

140 M. Crozier, The Bureaucratic Phenomena (London: Tavistock Publications, 1964), pp. 145-179.

This discussion of the systems perspective as applied to organizational design illustrates that this approach to organizational change, like the analytical approach of sociologists to social change, would appear to be the most viable in that it provides the conceptual framework within which change can be viewed. This approach is limited because of its inherent problem of the quantification of variable inter-relationships within the complete design, however.

Summary and Conclusions

The examination of the foregoing discussion of contemporary approaches to organizational change suggests that there are certain broad conclusions that can be drawn in relation to the topic, and further, it is also suggested that these approaches examined have provided viable concepts applicable within the organizational design as related to change. The broad conclusions are:

- 1 There is of yet no clear, comprehensive, and empirically operationalized analysis of the complete concept of organizational change.¹⁴¹

¹⁴¹ This lack of a viable theory of organization change is suggested by Bennis, Changing Organizations, p. 99, Blau and Scott, Formal Organizations, p. 223, and Litterer, Organizations, Structure and Behavior, p. 24, among others.

2 Contemporary approaches to organizational change tend to employ the systems perspective of organizational design as the framework for the analysis of change as of a continual nature, thereby causing the organization to undergo continuous change through adaptation and innovation.¹⁴²

3 Contemporary approaches to organizational change tend to concentrate on the planning, implementation, or application of change, primarily through that aspect of organizational design which is referred to as the actor, or the organization member. This tendency tends to de-emphasize the empirical operationalization of the change process, especially in areas not directly concerned with applied change.¹⁴³

¹⁴² The importance of this systems perspective is discussed by Leavitt, "Applied Organizational Change In Industry", Litterer, Organizations: Structure and Behavior, p. 19, Justin G. Longenbecker, Principles of Management and Organizational Behavior (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc., 1964), pp. 516-518, Parsons, Structure and Process In Modern Societies, p. 17, and Seiler, Systems Analysis In Organizational Behavior, p. 4.

¹⁴³ This emphasis on applied change through the actor approach is evident in the writings of its major proponents, which include: Chris Argyris, Organization and Innovation (Homewood, Ill.: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1965), Bennis, Changing Organizations, Warren G. Bennis, et al, eds., The Planning of Change (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961), Dale Carnegie, How To Win Friends and Influence People (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1933), Guest, Organizational Change, The Effects of Successful Leadership, Likert, New Patterns of Management, McGregor, The Human Side of Enterprise, and Whyte, Money and Motivation, among others.

Of the several primary important concepts that have been derived from these approaches to organizational change, the most important is that concept which considers the organization in terms of that organizational design which is the most efficient, wherein efficiency refers to the adaptability of that design to continual change.

Closely allied with this concept of organizational design in terms of efficiency, is the concept of how such an organizational design, in order to achieve maximum efficiency, can foster innovative and adaptive activities on the part of organization members. It is in this area of increasing innovative behavior that the actor approach has provided several important concepts, including those of control, leadership, role, decision-making, and methods of change.

Therefore, within the organizational design that desires to be most efficient, control must be utilized to prevent dysfunctional behavior, or that behavior which lessens organizational efficiency, and to enhance functional behavior, or that behavior which is innovative and tends to increase organizational efficiency in terms of its adaptability. In addition, the concept of leadership, in terms of maximizing organizational efficiency, refers to those leadership activities that are not of a routine nature, but to those leadership activities which foster functional behavior and which contribute to organizational efficiency.

The concept of decision-making, in contradiction to previous views which discussed it in rational or analytical terms, in order to contribute to organizational efficiency refers to the achievement of normative agreement among alternate possibilities, on the basis that even if such an agreement produces a less optimal solution, the process of agreement will provide a more optimal implementation of that solution, thereby contributing to innovative behavior and adaptability of the organization.

The actor approach, mainly through the work of Bennis, has suggested that the method of change, in terms of actor participation in shared power, may be more important than actual change variables in that participation contributes to more effective solution implementation. The concept of role as part of the organizational design resolves itself to the question of how roles can be structured in order to optimize organizational efficiency in terms of adaptability. The work of those proponents of the actor approach appears to indicate that roles which are structured loosely, or not highly specified, tend to enhance member innovative behavior in that they allow self-actualization, or fulfillment of the member's higher order needs.

In addition, the concept of communication, in terms of feedback and error correction functions, plays an important part in the efficiency of organizational design in that free flowing communication tends to

enhance functional behavior, whereas restricted communication flows tend to produce dysfunctional behavior, in that it restricts innovation and thereby reduces organizational efficiency.

This discussion of contemporary approaches to organizational change in terms of organization design has revealed that these approaches have resulted in the conceptualization of the organization in terms of adapting to continual change, and that therefore to allow for such continual adaptation through functional or innovative member behavior, the organizational design must employ certain concepts. These concepts, such as leadership, role, control, decision-making, and methods of change, then must be employed in such a manner to contribute to the basic need of the organizational design, that of adaptability.



CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This study was undertaken to examine the conceptual development of contemporary approaches to the nature and process of organizational change, primarily in relation to those concepts which have application in regard to that organizational design which copes most efficiently with change. It has examined the development of early evolutionary approaches to the analysis and understanding of social change as they provided the conceptual foundation for contemporary sociological analysis of social change, especially as evident in analytical and functional analysis.

This study has also surveyed contemporary sociological approaches to the analysis of social change, emphasizing analytical, functional, and certain other aspects of sociological thought as it has provided the conceptual basis for, and much of the input to, the analysis of change in the organizational setting.

In addition, it has examined current approaches to organizational change in terms of structural, technological, actor, and systems perspectives in order to delineate major themes existent in organization

theory literature as it deals with change. This study also discussed the current emphasis of the available literature on the process of planned change, and attempted to place it in the perspective of a composite overview of discussions of the change process in organizations.

As a result of the survey of the literature completed in this study it is possible to suggest that at the present time there are two dominant themes emphasized in organizational literature dealing with change:¹ Firstly, the emphasis on the process of planning or implementing change through a change agent; and secondly, the developing emphasis on the conceptualization of the organization as a social system coping with the primary problem of change and as such, the question becomes one of determining that organization design which copes most effectively with change.

¹ It must be noted that it is possible to argue with some validity that there is actually a third theme of organizational change existent in the available literature, that of the study of the process of change utilizing a structural-functional approach within the confines of general systems theory. See, for example, Alvin Boskoff, "Functional Analysis as a Source of a Theoretical Repertory and Research Tasks in the Study of Social Change", in Explorations in Social Change, ed. by G. Zollschan and W. Hirsch. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1964) pp. 215-243, or Talcott Parsons, The Social System (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1951), p. 535. The primary problem with such structural-functional analysis revolves around two areas, firstly that such analysis has not yet progressed to the point where a complete analysis of the change process is available, and secondly, such an approach does not provide strategic levers for manipulation of the organization in planned change. See Chapter V for a discussion of some of the problems of this approach.

The objective of this final chapter is then to summarize these two broad themes and also to provide some suggestions as to possible research topics which arise from the theories and concepts employed by these themes.

Summary of Concepts of Planned Change

The emphasis in organizational literature dealing with the problem of change probably arises from two basic factors as is suggested by Bennis:² firstly, since the end of the second world war, organizations have been faced with the problem of change, and the adaptation thereto, with much greater frequency than at any prior period, and this need of organizations has been coupled with an increasing willingness on the part of behavioral scientists to become more involved in applied theory; and secondly, not only has contemporary sociology failed to provide a viable theory of the nature and process of social change, but even those approaches to change that it has formulated tend to be couched in terms of the dynamic interaction of aspects of a social system, primarily from the viewpoint of an observer of change, and as such it has failed to provide strategic levers for the introduction or implementation of change in the organizational setting.

Thus, it may be suggested that recent emphasis on the concept of change arises from not only the organizational need for the assistance

² Warren G. Bennis, "Theory and Method in Applying Behavioral Science To Planned Organizational Change," in The Planning of Change, 2nd. ed. Edited by Bennis, et al. (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1969) pp. 196-209.



of behavioral scientists and the willingness of such scientists to provide it, but also from the lack of a viable and comprehensive theory of social change.

In the narrowest sense, the concept of planned change, as defined by Bennis,³ arises out of the conditions which fostered its growth in that it is defined as the involvement of the change agent, usually a behavioral scientist, in the application of valid knowledge in a collaborative attempt to solve the problems of a client system. A broader view of the concept of planned change which does not emphasize the role of the behavioral scientist to the same extent is that which holds that planned change is a normative approach to the problems of organizations involving the use of the systems perspective to delineate strategic variables, in a collaborative manner, in order to utilize such key variables in the solution of the clients problems.

This broader definition of planned change, especially when allied with the tendency of planned change to consider the key variable of the system as those individuals within that system, illustrates that in reality the planned change approach is not a distinctly different approach, it is more a normative application of the systems perspectives to immediate problems of an organization, wherein such problems are viewed primarily in terms of individuals.

3 Ibid., p. 198.

When viewed from this perspective, it becomes possible to consider the key elements of the planned change approach, such as the change agent, power sharing, behavior change, self directed change, and the view that the method of change may be more important than the change itself, as in fact primarily normative applications of many of the concepts considered as part of the actor approach to organizational change.

For example, the concept of the change agent may be expanded to include not only behavioral scientists who apply valid knowledge to the client system, but also cases where the change agent acts primarily as a catalyist for ideas already existent in the system but not yet deemed plausible. In addition, the change agent may be considered as a replacement in a key part of the system, or he may be considered as primarily a group discussion leader who attempts to draw solutions from individuals in the system.

In a like manner, the key aspect of the planned change approach that is usually couched in terms of power sharing can be viewed as a development of the power equalization process emphasized in the actor approach to change. This latter approach has suggested that if the use of power in change implementation can be viewed as a continuum bounded by the two extremes of unilateral implementation and complete

delegation, that approach to implementation of change which utilizes shared power along the continuum will be most successful.

The emphasis of the planned change approach on the process of changing behavior of individuals within the organizational system, usually wherein such change is effected through laboratory training, which may be T-Group or sensitivity training, may also be viewed as normative application of concepts arising from the actor approach to change. In discussing this concept of changing behavior, it must be noted that as much as the behavior of individuals is changed, unless the complete attitudes of the organization are changed in a like manner, individual behavior change will not remain for long periods, a limitation of this approach that is recognized in planned change approaches.

The concept of self directed change, which is directly allied to that of behavior change, in that it usually employs a modified form of T-Group in attempting to aid individuals in the accomplishment of personally decided change directions, is also related to the actor approach to organization change in that it concentrates on the individual. This concept of self directed change, however, has not become a dominant aspect of planned change in the organizational setting in that goals or objectives in the organization must be constructed in some collaborative manner with other organization members or they may be unrelated to organizational purposes.

In effect, this heavy emphasis of the planned change approach on similar concepts employed in the actor perspective of organizational change may be utilized to suggest that both come to the same identical conclusion, namely that the method of change, which must be through the individuals in the organization, becomes more important than either the nature or type of change. This conclusion is based on the premise that if the method of change is unacceptable to individual members of the organization, change, however plausible or good from the organizational viewpoint, may not be completed.

In suggesting concepts, theories, or practices of the planned change approach that would be useful in empirical research study of organizational change, it is possible to note two broad areas of investigation that are immediately relevant:

1. The analysis of a number of planned change incidents wherein successful changes, measured in terms of objective criteria such as performance, productivity, or other factors, are compared with unsuccessful change attempts in an attempt to delineate pertinent factors which could account for such a difference.⁴

⁴ It should be noted that there have been some attempts to carry out such analysis. See, for example, Larry E. Greiner, "Patterns of Organization Change", Harvard Business Review, May-June, 1967, pp. 119-130.

2. The utilization of a modified clinical-experimental approach in an attempt to assess the effectiveness of organizational change efforts and also to attempt to isolate factors or variables which appear to make the greatest contribution to such effectiveness. This approach, wherein specific and general hypothesis are constructed and tested within the experimental design is of necessity very difficult in the field conditions that exist in organizational change efforts, but if carefully constructed could provide some insight into the effectiveness of organizational change efforts.⁵

Within these two broad research applications of concepts or theories that are in use in regard to planned change, there are evident several interesting and potentially useful topics for investigation in regard to specific concepts of planned change, and also in regard to possible variables that are not covered in planned change approaches which could have some bearing on the effectiveness of planned change programs.

For example, the concept of the change agent itself and the effectiveness of its actions could form the basis of research investigations. Such investigation could cover change agent personalities, techniques, and possibly, backgrounds.

⁵ That some attempt is being made in this direction is evident in the work of Barbara A. Benedict, et al, "The Clinical-Experimental Approach to Assessing Organizational Change Efforts," The Journal of Applied Behavioral Sciences, 3, (July, August, September, 1967), 347-380.

In addition, the use of the power sharing concept in the planned change approach bears investigation. For example, the question as to differences in individual reaction to such shared power could be relevant, and in addition, the use of less power sharing techniques such as confrontation or unilateral power utilization in specific situations, such as those requiring rapid action, could possibly be more effective.⁶

There are also two other areas that, although not specifically covered in the planned change approaches, would appear to have some bearing on the effectiveness of planned change programs. The first of these is what may be termed the antecedents of planned change, or those conditions that are pre-existent prior to such change and which in fact may be a determinant factor in the ultimate effectiveness of such change.⁷ The second of these is that related to the leadership that exists in the organization prior to, and during such planned change. A very interesting question that must be raised in such a context is that which suggests that any change instituted by a change agent could

6 Some elements of this latter aspect, especially in terms of confrontation, are evident in Sheldon Davis, "An Organic Problem-Solving Method of Organizational Change," The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 3, (January-February-March, 1967), 3-21.

7 This is suggested by Larry E. Greiner, "Antecedents of Planned Organizational Change," The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 3 (January-February-March, 1967), 51-86.

probably have been organized and completed by existing leadership, although possibly at a later date. In addition, there appears to have been little follow-up investigation as to the continuance of planned change programs instituted by change agents in situations where leadership is weak.

This discussion of the primary concepts evident in planned change approaches has illustrated that in fact such approaches are actually a normative application of concepts arising out of the actor perspective of organizational change, and in addition, planned change perspectives in fact do employ the systems perspectives.

It would appear that the planned change approach, which involves basically consultative activities in the solution of organizational systems problems arising from change, has one primary drawback in that it is primarily an after the fact approach. A far more viable approach would consist of attempting to formulate an organizational design which because of its design could cope effectively in a continuous manner with the problems of change. This latter possibility then forms the remainder of this paper.

Summary of the Organizational Design Concept

It has been the contention of this study that the emerging theme of organizational literature dealing with organizational change is in terms of the necessity to design or structure organizations to provide efficiency, wherein efficiency is conceptualized as the need of organizations to deal with their primary problem, that of adaptability to change.⁸

The view of change as of a continuous and dialectic nature, and that because of this continuous nature of change, it is the primary problem of organizations, arises from the systems perspective. For example, the systems concept of Seiler can be utilized to illustrate that change can be the product of any change or interaction of internal variables, such as those of organization structure, technology, humanity,

⁸ This theme is particularly evident in the publications of: Warren G. Bennis, Changing Organizations: Essays On The Development And Evolution Of Human Organization (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1966), R. M. Cyert and J. G. March, A Behavioral Theory of The Firm (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1963), C. J. Haberstroh, "Organization Design and Systems Analysis" in Handbook of Organizations ed. by J. G. March, (Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1965), pp. 1171-1209, and J. D. Thompson, Organizations In Action (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1967).

or internal social values or, in addition, change can be the result of external variables such as market, government, technology, etcetera, thereby illustrating the importance of the necessity of organizational adaptation to these changes.⁹

In addition, Parsons has illustrated the importance of the necessity for social system adaptation to change when he suggests that social systems face four basic problems of goal attainment, pattern maintenance, adaptation, and integration, all of which have inherent the necessity to deal with change.¹⁰

The result of this emphasis on continuous change and the necessity for the organization to deal with it has been the conceptualization of organizational design in terms of its efficiency in dealing with change. This conceptualization in effect forms the basis of a research design in that it suggests various concepts in relation to how an organizational design should be structured to deal efficiently with change. The key concepts that form the basis of this research design as it is being suggested by recent organizational theorists, are those of efficiency, control, and innovation.

⁹ John A. Seiler, Systems Analysis in Organizational Behavior (Homewood, Ill : Richard D. Irwin, Inc., and The Dorsey Press, 1967), pp. 23-30.

¹⁰ Talcott Parsons, The Social System, pp. 167-177.

The basic problem of this research design that is being formulated through approaches to organizational design revolves around the concept of efficiency, and the criterion for measurement or analysis of relative degrees of efficiency, where efficiency is defined in terms of the adaptability to change.

This basic problem of the suggested research design for dealing with organizational change is most evident in the criticisms of Bennis,¹¹ who suggests that previously elaborated criteria of efficiency, as particularly evident in Seiler's suggestion of criteria in terms of job satisfaction, job productivity, and job development,¹² tend to emphasize either performance or satisfaction, two criteria which are ambiguous, difficult to measure, have inherent several value connotations, and which are questionable in utility. The major drawback of criteria such as those of performance or satisfaction, however, is that in terms of providing measurement capabilities within a research design for dealing with change in terms of efficient organizational adaptation to such change, they do not suggest criteria for the analysis and measurement of efficiency.

In order to overcome this problem of criteria for efficiency as it can be measured within the research design, Bennis has suggested a more promising approach can be observed in organizational literature,

11 Bennis, Changing Organizations, pp. 36-38.

12 Seiler, Systems Analysis In Organizational Behavior, pp. 30-33.

an approach that suggests three major criteria for the analysis of efficiency, these being: the criterion of multiple goals, the criterion of the situation, and the criterion of system characteristics.¹³

The criterion of multiple goals, derived from the systems perspective of Parsons in relation to his pattern maintenance characteristics, suggests that due to the multiplicity of possible goals in each organization, each such system produces a different value system because of the interaction of goals. Therefore, each organization or system has several criteria of efficiency in terms of factors such as loyalty, confidence, adequacy of communication, amount and quality of teamwork, etcetera, and because of the recent advances of the behavioral sciences in the measurement of these basically psychological characteristics, they are viable criteria.¹⁴

The second criterion, that of the criterion of the situation, suggests that since organizations differ with respect to goals, they can be distinguished in terms of the primacy of orientation to the attainment of a specific goal, this definition again developing from the work of Parsons.¹⁵ This criterion suggests that organization

13 Bennis, Changing Organizations, pp. 38-41.

14 Much of the development of these criteria is based on the work of R. Likert, "Measuring Organizational Performance", Harvard Business Review, 36, (March-April, 1958), 41-50.

15 This criterion, suggested in Bennis, Changing Organizations, p. 39, is particularly evident in the discussion of primacy of orientation in Talcott Parsons, "Suggestions for a Sociological Approach To The

typology can be distinguished in terms of the primacy of orientation of that organization, for example, the personnel department of an organization, in fulfilling its primary orientation to the organizational goal of pattern maintenance, will develop a different typology than a research department, whose primacy of orientation is towards the organizational goal of adaptation.

The criterion of system characteristics, which is based on structural functional analysis, suggests that structural functional analysis relates variable behavior to assumed stable system of needs and mechanisms.¹⁶ Thus, a social system is assumed to have basic needs which are essentially those of self-maintenance, and in order to satisfy these needs the organization or system develops mechanisms for self-defence and that activities can be interpreted in terms of the function they serve in the maintenance and defence of the system.¹⁷

Theory of Organizations", Administrative Science Quarterly, 1, (1956), 63-85.

16 This is suggested by Bennis, Changing Organizations, p. 39, and P. Selznick "Foundations of the Theory of Organizations", American Sociological Review, 13, (1948), 25-35.

17 Selznick, "Foundations of the Theory of Organizations".

For example, Selznick suggests five basic system needs, including the security of the organization in relation to its environment, the stability of lines of authority and communication, the stability of informal relations within the organization, the continuity of policy, and a homogeneity of outlook with respect to the meaning and role of the organization.¹⁸ The criterion of system characteristics, then, as utilized in the analysis of efficiency would view variable behavior as it is functional in terms of these needs.

Therefore, if the contention of Bennis is correct, wherein he suggests that organizational literature is really a catalogue of problems of organizational change, and if the organization is viewed in terms of its primary problem of adapting to change,¹⁹ these more recent criteria of effectiveness must be employed within the research design context in order to delineate methods whereby organizational efficiency can be enhanced. In addition, research designs must then disregard inferences of efficiency based on static measures of output or satisfaction, and emphasize measures of efficiency which view organizations as adaptive, problem-solving and organic structures.

Such a research design must also include the dual concepts of innovation, in terms of how these are related to the dealing with the basic problem facing organizations, that of adapting to change.

¹⁸ Ibid. See also Bennis, Changing Organizations, pp. 39-41 for a discussion of other criterion approaches.

¹⁹ Bennis, Changing Organizations, pp. 41-44.

Thus, the concept of control, when employed within the context of a research design which is examining the problem of organizational adaptation, would be viewed as the prevention of that behavior which in terms of organizational efficiency is dysfunctional, or the obverse thereof, which holds the function of control to be that of making behavior functional in terms of increasing organizational adaptability and efficiency.²⁰

Directly related to this concept of control is that of innovation, wherein innovation is the dynamic process of adaptation, and therefore it too is considered in functional terms in that innovation must be functional in terms of increasing organizational efficiency.²¹ The key relationship of these two concepts is in terms of the necessity to view control as enhancing functional behavior, wherein functional behavior can be viewed as functional innovative behavior which is directed to increasing organizational efficiency.

These three concepts of efficiency, control, and innovation in this manner form the basis of the research design that is emerging in organizational literature which is being utilized to analyse the basic problem facing modern organizations, that of adaptability to change.

²⁰ This changing view of the nature of control is suggested by Bennis, Changing Organizations, p. 185, Thompson, Organizations In Action, pp. 132-143, and Tannenbaum, Control in Organizations, pp. 310-312.

²¹ See for example, J. D. Thompson, "Innovation in Organization, Notes Toward A Theory", in Approaches To Organizational Design, ed. by Thompson, pp. 193-218.

The utilization of this research design in the understanding and analysis of that organizational design or structure that is most adaptive to change has already suggested the necessity to reconsider some traditional managerial concepts in terms of their relationship to organizational efficiency. This contention can be illustrated by referring to the concepts of communication, leadership, decision-making, role, power, and motivation.

The concept of communication, within the concept of the efficient organizational design, must be so employed as to enhance the free-flow of information, which through its error-correction and feedback processes contributes to organizational adaptability.²² The traditional approach to communications in terms of the hierarchial flow of information would no longer appear to be viable, and communication must be as unrestricted as possible, both laterally and vertically, in order to enhance the free flow of communications that is necessary in effective problem solving through innovative behavior.

22 For a discussion of the dysfunctional communication effects of the hierarchial structure see P. M. Blau and W. R. Scott, Formal Organizations: A Comparative Approach (San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Co., 1962) pp. 242-244. For general discussions on the need for the free flow of communications see Blau and Scott, Formal Organizations, pp. 116-139, H. J. Leavitt, Managerial Psychology: An Introduction to Individuals, Pairs, and Groups In Organizations (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958), pp. 192-205, and W. G. Scott, "Organization Theory: An Overview and An Appraisal", in Organizations: Structure and Behavior (New York: ed. by J. A. Litterer (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1963), p. 23.

In addition, the traditional view of leadership as consisting primarily of coercive or manipulative techniques fails to recognize the necessity to employ leadership in such a manner as to encourage innovative behavior.²³ Katz and Kahn have provided the basis of this latter leadership perspective when they suggest leadership consists of those non routine aspects of leadership which are designed to encourage functional behavior.²⁴ In addition, the recently increasing emphasis on leadership as a function of the situation further serves to illustrate the necessity to revise traditional leadership concepts and techniques.²⁵

The concept of decision making, as it could be employed within the context of efficiency of organizational design, tends to emphasize more the achievement of normative agreement on decisions on the basis that such agreement will enhance functional behavior in the decision implementation.²⁶ This is not to indicate that the rational

23 For discussions of the necessity to exercise leadership in a manner conducive to innovative behavior, see: Blau and Scott, Formal Organizations, pp. 237-240, and D. Katz and R. L. Kahn, The Social Psychology of Organizations (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966) pp. 300-335.

24 Katz and Kahn, The Social Psychology Of Organizations, pp. 300-335.

25 Ibid., p. 335.

26 This is suggested by H. J. Leavitt, "Applied Organizational Change in Industry, Structural, Technological, and Humanistic Approaches", in Handbook of Organizations, ed. by March, p. 1165.

optimal approach to decision making, especially as propounded by March and Simon,²⁷ is not a viable approach, it indicates more that whatever the basis for the decision, whether rational or inductive, that a need exists for normative agreement to ensure effective implementation of the decision.

The approach to organizational change in terms of efficiency of organizational designs in adapting to change has necessitated a review of the traditional concept of role, especially that concept of rigid role structure as employed in the bureaucratic structure.²⁸ Much of recent organizational literature has tended to suggest that innovative behavior tends to be restricted in organizations where roles are rigidly specified, and that in organizations employing less rigid role specificity, such as Burns and Staulker's mechanistic type, innovative behavior tends to occur.²⁹ The question of role conflict must be

27 J. G. March and H. A. Simon, Organizations (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958), pp. 137-171.

28 A review of the role concept, in terms of high vs. low specificity, is available in D. J. Hickson, "Convergence In Organizational Theory", Administrative Science Quarterly, 11, (Sept., 1966) pp. 224-237.

29 T. Burns and G. M. Staulker, The Management of Innovation (London: Tavistock Publications Ltd., 1961) pp. 121-122.

considered, for this postulation that innovative behavior is related to less rigid roles is based on the view that conflict tends to increase innovation, whereas it is conceivable that conflict beyond a certain point may actually induce dysfunctional behavior. It would then appear that completely unspecified roles may induce such conflict that functional behavior, in terms of efficiency of organizational design, may not be possible.³⁰

The concept of power would appear to be undergoing some revision as a result of this recent emphasis on considering the organization in terms of dealing with uncertainty, wherein a major cause of such uncertainty is change.³¹ For example, the work of Crozier would appear to indicate that sources of power, which were traditionally considered to have arisen from the legitimate authority structure, in fact tend to be related to uncertainty in that that aspect of the organization which most effectively copes with the last remaining uncertainty in a routinized organization will tend to exert the most power.³² This would appear to be a logical concept relating to the efficient organizational design in that if the major problem facing

30 This problem is suggested by Hickson, "Convergence in Organization Theory", p. 235.

31 See, for example, J. D. Thompson, Organizations In Action, and Cyert and March, A Behavioral Theory of the Firm.

32 M. Crozier, The Bureaucratic Phenomenon (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1964), pp. 145-161.

organizations is that of uncertainty or change, therefore that aspect of the organization which deals most effectively with this major organizational problem should then exert the greatest relative power within the organization.

An additional concept that must be considered in discussing the efficiency of organizational designs in dealing with change, is that of recently revised views of human motivation.³³ The relationship of this concept with the efficient organizational design is in terms of the suggestion that since individuals would appear to be motivated towards fulfilment of higher order needs such as self satisfaction, that organization design which is so structured to allow such need satisfaction will tend to encourage innovative behavior, which in turn contributes to organizational efficiency.

This very brief review of the organizational design concept has served to illustrate that the emerging trend in organizational literature of suggesting research designs for the consideration of organizational change, in spite of the conceptual difficulty of

33 This revised motivational view, originally suggested in A. Maslow, Motivation and Personality (New York: Harper and Bros., 1964), is evident in a number of recent publications especially: C. Argyris, Integrating The Individual and the Organization (New York: Wiley, 1964), and D. McGregor, The Human Side of Enterprise (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960).

measurement of efficiency, would appear to be the most viable view for the analysis of change. In addition, the conceptual basis of previous approaches to change, when employed within this new research design, has revealed the possibility of being able to restructure the organization design in order to deal most efficiently with change.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

- Allen, Francis R.; Hart, Hornell; Miller, Delbert C.; Ogburn, William F.; and Nimkoff, Meyer F., eds. Technology and Social Change. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1957.
- Allen, Louis A. Management and Organization. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1958.
- Applewhite, Philip B. Organizational Behavior. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965.
- Argyris, Chris. Integrating The Individual and the Organization. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1964.
- _____. Organization and Innovation. Homewood, Ill.: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1965.
- _____. Understanding Organizational Behavior. Homewood, Ill.: The Dorsey Press, 1960.
- Athos, Anthony G., and Coffey, Robert E. Behavior In Organizations: A Multidimensional View. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1968.
- Barnes, Harry Elmer. Historical Sociology: Its Origins and Development. New York: The Philosophical Library, 1948.
- Becker, Howard, and Boskoff, Alvin, eds. Modern Sociological Theory. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1957.
- Beer, Stafford. Cybernetics and Management. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1959.
- Bell, Gerald D., ed. Organizations and Human Behavior: A Book of Readings. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967.
- Bennis, Warren G. Changing Organizations: Essays on the Development and Evolution of Human Organization. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1966.

- Bennis, Warren G.; Benne, Kenneth D.; and Chin Robert, eds. The Planning of Change. 2nd ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1969.
- Black, Max, ed. The Social Theories of Talcott Parsons. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1961.
- Blake, Robert, R., and Mouton, Jane S. The Managerial Grid: Key Orientations for Achieving Production Through People. Houston, Texas: Gulf Publishing Company, 1964.
- Blau, Peter M. Bureaucracy In Modern Society. New York: Random House, Inc., 1956.
- _____. The Dynamics of Bureaucracy. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955.
- _____. and Scott, Richard W. Formal Organizations: A Comparative Approach. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company, 1962.
- Bogardus, Elmer S. The Development of Social Thought. 4th ed. New York: Longmans, Green, and Company, 1960.
- Boulding, Kenneth E. Economic Analysis. 3rd ed. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1955.
- Bowers, D. G., and Seashore, S. E. Changing the Structure and Functioning of an Organization. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1963.
- Bright, J. R. Technology and Automation. Boston: Harvard University Press, 1958.
- Brown, Alvin. Organization: A Formulation of Principles. New York: Hibbert Printing Company, 1945.
- Buckley, Walter. Sociology and Modern Systems Theory. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967.
- Burns, Tom, and Saul, S. B., eds. Social Theory and Economic Change. London: Tavistock Publications, 1967.
- _____. and Stalker, G. M. The Management of Innovation. London: Tavistock Publications, 1961.
- Caplow, Theodore. Principles of Organization. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, Inc., 1964.
- Carzo, Rocco, Jr., and Yanouzas, John N. Formal Organizations: A Systems Approach. Homewood, Ill.: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., and The Dorsey Press, 1967.

- Chandler, A. J., Jr. Strategy and Structure: Chapters in the History of the Industrial Enterprise. Boston: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press, 1962.
- Cooper, W. W.; Leavitt, H. J.; and Shelly, M. W., II, eds. New Perspectives in Organization Research. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1954.
- Cotgrove, Stephen. The Science of Society: An Introduction To Sociology. London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1967.
- Crozier, M. The Bureaucratic Phenomenon. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964.
- Cyert, Richard M., and March, James G. A Behavioral Theory of the Firm. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963.
- Dahl, Robert A.; Haire, Mason; and Lazarsfeld, Paul F. Social Science Research on Business: Product and Potential. New York: Columbia University Press, 1959.
- Dale, Ernest. Organization. New York: American Management Association, 1967.
- Drucker, Peter. The Practice of Management. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1954.
- Dunnette, Marvin D., and Kirchner, Wayne K. Psychology Applied to Industry. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1965.
- Eisenstadt, S.N., ed. Comparative Perspectives on Social Change. Boston, Little, Brown, and Company, Inc., 1968.
- Eisenstadt, S. N. Essays on Comparative Institutions. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1965.
- Elmer, E. C. Contemporary Social Thought: Contributions and Trends. Pittsburg: University of Pittsburg Press, 1956.
- Etzioni, Amitai. A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations; On Power, Involvement, and Their Correlates. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1961.
- _____. Complex Organizations: A Sociological Reader. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1961.
- _____. Modern Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1964.

- _____. Studies in Social Change. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1966.
- _____. and Etzioni, Eva. eds. Social Change: Sources, Patterns, and Consequences. New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers, 1964.
- Ginsberg, Eli, and Reilley, Ewing W. Effecting Change In Large Organizations. New York: Columbia University Press, 1957.
- Guest, Robert H. Organizational Change: The Effect of Successful Leadership. Homewood, Ill.: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1962.
- Gulick, L., and Urwick, L., eds. Papers in the Science of Administration. New York: Institute of Public Administration, 1937.
- Haberstroh, Chadwick J., and Rubenstein, Albert H., eds. Some Theories of Organization. Homewood, Ill.: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., and The Dorsey Press, 1966.
- Haire, Mason, ed. Modern Organization Theory. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1959.
- Hagen, Everitt E. On The Theory of Social Change: How Economic Growth Begins. Homewood, Ill.: The Dorsey Press, Inc., 1962.
- Hampton, David R. Behavioral Concepts in Management. Belmont, California: Dickenson Publishing Company, Inc., 1968.
- _____. Summer, Charles E.; and Webber, Ross A. Organizational Behavior and The Practice of Management. Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman, and Company, 1968.
- Hill, Walter A., and Egan, Douglas M., eds. Readings in Organizational Theory: A Behavioral Approach. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1967.
- House, Floyd Nelson. The Development of Sociology. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1936.
- Hutchinson, John G. Organizations: Theory and Classical Concepts. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1967.
- Johnson, Richard A.; Kast, Fremont E.; Rosenzweig, James E. The Theory and Management of Systems. 2nd. ed. New York; McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1967.
- Judson, Arnold S. A Manager's Guide To Making Changes. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966.

- Kahn, Robert L., et al. Organizational Stress: Studies in Role Conflict and Ambiguity. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1964.
- Katz, Daniel, and Kahn, Robert L. The Social Psychology of Organizations. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966.
- Koontz, Harold, ed. Toward a Unified Theory of Management. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1964.
- LaPiere, Richard T. Social Change. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1957.
- Learned, E. P., and Sproat, Audrey T. Organization Theory and Policy: Notes for Analysis. Homewood, Ill.: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1966.
- Leavitt, Harold J. Managerial Psychology: An Introduction To Individuals, Pairs, and Groups in Organizations. 2nd ed. Chicago: University Of Chicago Press, 1964.
- _____. Harold J., ed. The Social Science of Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963.
- Le Breton, Preston P., ed. Comparative Administrative Theory. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1968.
- Levy, Marion J., Jr. The Structure of Society. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1952.
- Likert, Rensis. New Patterns of Management. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1961.
- Litterer, Joseph A. The Analysis of Organizations. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1965.
- _____. ed. Organizations: Structure and Behavior. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1963.
- Longenecker, Justin G. Principles of Management and Organizational Behavior. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc., 1964.
- Loomis, Charles P. Social Systems: Essays on Their Persistence and Change. New York: D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc., 1960.
- _____. and Loomis, Z. Modern Social Theories: Selected American Writers. Princeton, N.J.: D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc., 1961.

- Lupton, Tom. Management and The Social Sciences: An Essay. London: Hutchinson and Company, Publishers, 1966.
- March, James G., ed. Handbook of Organizations. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1965.
- _____. and Simon, Herbert A. Organizations. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958.
- Martindale, Don. Social Life and Cultural Change. Princeton, N.J. D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc., 1962.
- Maslow, Abraham H. Motivation and Personality. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1954.
- Maus, Heinz. A Short History of Sociology. New York: The Philosophical Library, Inc., 1962.
- McGregor, Douglas. The Human Side of Enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1960.
- McNall, Scott G., ed. The Sociological Perspective: Introductory Readings. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1968.
- Merril, Francis E. Social Problems. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1950.
- Merton, Robert K. Social Theory and Social Structure. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1949.
- _____. et al eds. Sociology Today, Problems and Perspectives. New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers, 1959.
- _____. et al, Reader in Bureaucracy. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1952.
- Moore, Wilbert E. Order and Change: Essays in Comparative Sociology. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1967.
- _____. Social Change. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963.
- _____. and Cook, Robert M., eds. Readings On Social Change. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967.
- Mosson, T. M., ed. Teaching The Process of Management: The Proceedings of an International Seminar. London: George G. Harrap and Company, Ltd., 1967.

- Mouzelis, Nicos P. Organization and Bureaucracy: An Analysis of Modern Theories. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, Ltd., 1967.
- Nordskog, John Eric. Social Change. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1960.
- O'Connell, Jeremiah J. Managing Organizational Innovation. Homewood, Ill.: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1968.
- Optner, Stanford L. Systems Analysis For Business Management. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1960.
- Parker, S. R., et al. The Sociology of Industry. Frederick A. Praeger, Inc., Publishers, 1967.
- Parsons, Talcott. Societies: Evolutionary and Comparative Perspectives. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966.
- _____. Structure and Process in Modern Societies. New York: The Free Press, 1960.
- _____. The Structure of Social Action. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1949.
- _____. Shills, E.; Naegele, K.D.; and Pitts, J.R.; eds. Theories of Society. Vol II. New York: The Free Press, Inc., 1961.
- Pigors, Paul; Meyers, Charles A.; and Malm, F. T. Management of Human Resources. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1964.
- Ponsioen, J. A. The Analysis of Social Change Reconsidered. The Hague, Netherlands: Mouton and Company, Publishers, 1962.
- Porter, Donald E., and Applewhite, Philip B., eds. Organizational Behavior and Management. Scranton, Pennsylvania: International Textbook Company, 1964.
- Presthus, Robert, The Organizational Society: An Analysis and a Theory. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1962.
- Pugh, D. S.; Hickson, D. J.; and Hinings, C. R. Writers on Organizations: An Introduction. London: Hutchinson and Company, Publishers, Ltd., 1964.
- Rubenstein, Albert H., and Haberstroh, Chadwick J. Some Theories of Organization. Homewood, Ill.: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., and The Dorsey Press, 1966.

- Sayles, Leonard R. Managerial Behavior: Administration in Complex Organizations. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1964.
- Schein, Edgar H. Organizational Psychology. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965.
- Schon, Donald A. Technology and Change. New York: Delacorte Press, 1967.
- Scott, William G. Organization Theory: A Behavioral Analysis for Management. Homewood, Ill.: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1967.
- Seiler, John A. Systems Analysis in Organizational Behavior. Homewood, Ill.: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., and The Dorsey Press, 1967.
- Siffin, William J., ed. Toward The Comparative Study of Public Administration. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1959.
- Simon, Herbert A. The New Science of Management Decision. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960.
- Sims, N. L. The Problem of Social Change. New York: Crowell Publishing Company, 1939.
- Sorokin, Pitrim A. Contemporary Sociological Theories. New York: Harper, 1928.
- _____. Society, Culture, and Personality: Their Structure and Dynamics, A System of General Sociology. New York: Cooper Square Publishers, 1962.
- _____. Sociological Theories of Today. New York: Harper and Row, 1966.
- Spicer, Edward N., ed. Human Problems in Technological Change: A Casebook. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1952.
- Steiner, Gary A., ed. The Creative Organization. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1965.
- Strauss, George, and Sayles, Leonard R. Personnel: The Human Problems of Management. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967.

- Tannenbaum, Arnold S. Control in Organizations. New York: McGraw-Hill Hill Book Company, 1968.
- _____. Social Psychology of The Work Organization. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc., 1966.
- Thompson, James D. Organizations in Action. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1967.
- _____. , ed. Approaches to Organizational Design. Pittsburg: University of Pittsburg Press, 1966.
- Thompson, Victor A. Modern Organization. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1961.
- Timasheff, Nicholas S. Sociological Theory: Its Nature and Growth. New York: Random House, 1957.
- Waldo, Dwight. The Administrative State: A Study of the Political Theory of American Public Administration. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1948.
- Washburne, Norman F. Interpreting Social Change In America. New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1954.
- Williams, Robin M., Jr. American Society, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1951.
- Weber, Max. The Theory of Social and Economic Organization. Translated by M. Henderson and T. Parsons, Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1947.
- Whyte, W. F., ed. Money and Motivation. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1955.
- Zollschan, George K., and Hirsh, Walter, eds. Explorations in Social Change. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1964.

ARTICLES

- Argyris, Chris. "The Individual and Organization: Some Problems of Mutual Adjustment." Administrative Science Quarterly, 2 (1957), 1-24.
- Barnes, Louis B. "Approaches To Organizational Change." The Planning of Change. 2nd ed. Edited by W. G. Bennis, K. D. Benne, and R. Chin. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1969.
- Bartlett, Alton C. "Changing Behavior as a Means to Increased Efficiency." Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 3 (July-August-September, 1967), 381-403.
- Bell, Gerald D. "Formality Versus Flexibility in Complex Organizations." Organizations and Human Behavior: A Book of Readings. Edited by Gerald D. Bell. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967.
- Benedict, Barbara A.; Calder, Paula H.; Callahan, Daniel M.; Hornstein, Harvey A.; and Miles, Matthew B. "The Clinical-Experimental Approach to Assessing Organizational Change Efforts." Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 3 (July-August-September, 1967), 347-380.
- Bennis, Warren G. "A New Role For The Behavioral Sciences: Effecting Organizational Change." Administrative Science Quarterly, 8, (1963), 125.
- _____. "Theory and Method in Applying Behavioral Science To Planned Organizational Change." The Planning of Change. 2nd ed. Edited by W. G. Bennis, K. D. Benne, and R. Chin. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1969.
- _____. "Toward a 'Truly' Scientific Management: The Concept of Organizational Health." Industrial Management Review, 4 (1962), 1-27.

- Black, Max. "Some Questions About Parsons' Theories." The Social Theories of Talcott Parsons. Edited by Max Black. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1961.
- Boskoff, Alvin. "Functional Analysis as a Source of a Theoretical Repertory and Research Tasks in the Study of Social Change." Explorations in Social Change. Edited by G. K. Zollschan and W. Hirsch. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1964.
- Bower, Marvin. "Nurturing Innovation In An Organization." The Creative Organization. Edited by Gary A. Steiner. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965.
- Bowers, David G., and Seashore, Stanley E. "Predicting Organizational Effectiveness with a 4-Factor Theory of Leadership." Administrative Science Quarterly, 11 (1966-67), 238-263.
- Burns, T. "Micropolitics: Mechanisms of Institutional Change." Administrative Science Quarterly, 6 (1961), 257-281.
- Cadwallader, Mervyn L. "The Cybernetic Analysis of Change." Social Change: Sources, Patterns, and Consequences. Edited by Amitai Etzioni and Eva Etzioni. New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers, 1964.
- Cancian, Francesca. "Functional Analysis of Change." Social Change: Sources, Patterns, and Consequences. Edited by Amitai Etzioni and Eva Etzioni. New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers, 1964.
- Cartwright, Dorwin. "Influence, Leadership and Control." Handbook of Organizations. Edited by James G. March. Chicago: Rand McNalley and Company, 1965.
- Coch, Lester, and French, J. R. P. "Overcoming Resistance To Change." Human Relations, 1 (1948), 512-532.
- Coser, Lewis A. "Social Conflict and The Theory of Social Change." The Sociological Perspective: Introductory Readings. Edited by Scott G. McNall. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, Inc., 1968.
- . "The Termination of Conflict." Social Change: Sources, Patterns, and Consequences. Edited by Amitai Etzioni and Eva Etzioni. New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers, 1964.

- Darendorf, Ralf. "Toward a Theory of Social Conflict." Social Change: Sources, Patterns, and Consequences. Edited by Amitai Etzioni and Eva Etzioni. New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers, 1964.
- Davis, Sheldon A. "An Organic Problem-Solving Method of Organizational Change." Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 3 (January-February-March, 1967), 3-21.
- Estes, Hugh. "Some Considerations In Designing An Organization Structure." Organization Theory In Industrial Practice. Edited by Mason Haire. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1962.
- Etzioni, Amitai. "Leaders Control and Members' Compliance." Organizations and Human Behavior: A Book of Readings. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967.
- Faris, Robert E. L. "Contemporary and Prospective Social Disorganization." Social Change: Sources, Patterns, and Consequences. Edited by Amitai Etzioni and Eva Etzioni. New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers, 1964.
- Goss, Bertrand M. "What are Your Organization's Objectives? A General Systems Approach to Planning." Human Relations, 18 (August, 1965), 195-216.
- Greiner, Larry E. "Antecedents of Planned Organizational Change." Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 3, (January-February-March, 1967), 51-85.
- Guetzkow, Harold. "Communications in Organizations." Handbook of Organizations. Edited by James G. March. Chicago: Rand McNalley and Company, 1965.
- Haberstroh, Chadwick J. "Control as an Organizational Process." Some Theories of Organization. Edited by Albert H. Rubenstein and Chadwick J. Haberstroh. Homewood, Ill.: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., and The Dorsey Press, 1966.
- _____. "Organization Design and Systems Analysis." Handbook of Organizations. Edited by James G. March. Chicago: Rand McNalley and Company, 1965.
- Hage, Jerald. "An Axiomatic Theory of Organizations." Administrative Science Quarterly, 10 (1965), 289-320.

- Haire, Mason. "Psychology and The Study of Business." Social Science Research on Business: Product and Potential. Edited by R. A. Dahl, M. Haire, and P. Lazarsfeld. New York: Columbia University Press, 1959.
- Hickson, D. J. "Convergence in Organizational Theory." Administrative Science Quarterly, 11 (Sept. 1966), 224-237.
- Jasinski, Frank J. "The Dynamics of Organizational Behavior." Behavioral Concepts In Management. Belmont, Claifornia: Dickson Publishing Company, Inc., 1968.
- Kahn, Robert L. "Leadership Patterns in Organizational Effectiveness." Sixth Annual Conference. Montreal, Quebec: Industrial Relations Center, McGill University, 1954.
- Kallen, Horace M. "Innovation." The Encyclopedia of The Social Sciences, Vol. 4. Edited by Edwin Seligman and Alvin Johnson. New York: Macmillan and Company, 1937.
- Lawrence, Lois C., and Smith, Patricia Cain. "Group Decision and Employee Participation." The Journal of Applied Psychology, 39 (1955), 334-337.
- Lake, Dale G. "Concepts of Change and Innovation in 1966." Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, I, (January-February-March, 1968), 3-24.
- Leavitt, Harold J. "Applied Organizational Change in Industry: Structural, Technological, and Humanistic Approaches." Handbook of Organizations. Edited by James G. March, Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1965.
- _____. "Unhuman Organizations." Harvard Business Review, 40 (July-August, 1962), 90-98.
- Likert, Rensis. "A Motivational Approach to a Modified Theory of Management." Modern Organization Theory. Edited by Mason Haire. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1959.
- _____. "Effective Supervision: An Adaptive and Relative Process." Personnel Psychology, II (1958), 317-332.
- _____. "Measuring Organizational Performance." Harvard Business Review, 36 (March-April, 1958), 41-50.

- _____. "Motivation: The Core of Management." Management of Human Resources. Edited by Paul Pigors, Charles A. Meyers, and F. T. Malm. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1964.
- Linton, Ralph. "Discovery, Invention, and Their Cultural Setting." Social Change: Sources, Patterns, and Consequences. Edited by Amitai Etzioni and Eva Etzioni. New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers, 1964.
- Litchfield, Edward H. "Notes on a General Theory of Administration." Administrative Science Quarterly, 1 (1956), 3-29.
- Lowin, Aaron. "Participative Decision Making: A Model, Literature Critique, and Prescriptions For Research." Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 3 (1968), 68-106.
- McClelland, David C. "Business Drive and National Achievement." Organizations and Human Behavior: A Book of Readings. Edited by Gerald D. Bell. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967.
- McGregor, Douglas. "An Analysis of Leadership." Leadership and Motivation. Edited by Warren G. Bennis and Edgar H. Schein. Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press, 1966.
- _____. "Conditions of Effective Leadership in the Industrial Organization." Leadership and Motivation. Edited by Warren G. Bennis and Edgar H. Schein. Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press, 1966.
- _____. "The Human Side of Enterprise." Management of Human Resources. Edited by Paul Pigors, Charles A. Meyers, and F. T. Malm. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1964.
- MacIver, R. M. "The Role of the Precipitant." Social Change: Sources, Patterns, and Consequences. Edited by Amitai Etzioni and Eva Etzioni. New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers, 1964.
- McNulty, James E. "Organizational Change in Growing Enterprises." Administrative Science Quarterly, 7 (1962), 1.
- March, James G., and Simon, H. A. "Dysfunctions In Organizations." Organizations and Human Behavior: A Book of Readings. Edited by Gerald D. Bell. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967.
- Massie, Joseph L. "Management Theory." Handbook of Organizations. Edited by James G. March. Chicago: Rand McNalley and Company, 1965.

- Merton, Robert K. "Bureaucratic Structure and Personality." Organizations and Human Behavior: A Book of Readings. Edited by Gerald D. Bell. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967.
- _____. "The Environment of the Innovating Organization: Some Conjectures and Proposals." The Creative Organization. Edited by Gary A. Steiner. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965.
- Miller, Delbert C. "Theories of Social Change." Technology and Social Change. Edited by F. R. Allen, et al. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1957.
- Morse, Nancy, and Reimer, E. "The Experimental Change of a Major Organizational Variable." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 42 (1956), 120-129.
- Parsons, Talcott. "A Functional Theory of Change." Social Change: Sources, Patterns, and Consequences. Edited by Amitai Etzioni and Eva Etzioni. New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers, 1964.
- _____. "Suggestions For a Sociological Approach To The Theory of Organizations." Administrative Science Quarterly, 1 (1956), 63-85.
- Peterson, Peter G. "Some Approaches to Innovation In Industry." The Creative Organization. Edited by Gary A. Steiner. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965.
- Pugh, D. S., et al. "A Conceptual Scheme For Organization Analysis." Administrative Science Quarterly, 8 (1963), 289-315.
- Rosenfield, J. M., and Smith, M. J. "Participative Management, An Overview." Personnel Journal, 46 (February, 1967), 101-104.
- Sayles, Leonard R. "The Change Process in Organizations: An Applied Anthropology Analysis." Readings In Organizational Theory: A Behavioral Approach. Edited by Walter A. Hill and Douglas M. Egan. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1966.
- Schein, Edgar H. "The Mechanisms of Change." The Planning of Change. 2nd ed. Edited by W. G. Bennis, K. D. Benne, and R. Chin. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1969.

- Schiff, Asley L. "Innovation and Administrative Decision Making." Administrative Science Quarterly, II (1966), 1-30.
- Schoen, Donald R. "Managing Technological Innovation." Harvard Business Review, (May-June, 1969), 156-167.
- Seashore, Stanley E. "Criteria of Organizational Effectiveness." Michigan Business Review, 17 (July, 1965), 26-30.
- _____. and Yuchtmas, Ephrian. "Factorial Analysis of Organizational Performance." Administrative Science Quarterly, 22 (December, 1967), 377-395.
- Selznick, P. "Foundations of the Theory of Organizations." American Sociological Review, 13 (1948), 25-35.
- Sheppard, Herbert A. "Changing Interpersonal and Intergroup Relationships in Organizations." Handbook of Organizations. Edited by James G. March. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1965.
- _____. "Innovation-Resisting and Innovation-Producing Organizations." The Planning of Change. 2nd ed. Edited by W. G. Bennis, K. D. Benne, and R. Chin. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1969.
- Spencer, P., and Sofer, C. "Organizational Change and its Management." Journal of Management Studies, 1 (1964), 26-47.
- Starbuck, William H. "Organizational Growth and Development." Handbook of Organizations. Edited by James G. March. Chicago, Rand McNalley and Company, 1965.
- Stogdill, Ralph M. "Dimensions of Organization Theory." Approaches To Organizational Design. Edited by James D. Thompson. Pittsburg: University of Pittsburg Press, 1966.
- Strauss, George. "Some Notes on Power Equalization." The Social Science of Organizations. Edited by Harold J. Leavitt. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963.
- Strother, George B. "Problems in the Development of a Social Science of Organization." The Social Science of Organizations. Edited by Harold J. Leavitt. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963.
- Tannenbaum, Arnold S. "Control and Effectiveness in a Voluntary Organization." American Journal of Sociology, 47 (1961), 33-46.

- _____. "Control in Organizations, Individual Adjustment and Organizational Performance." Administrative Science Quarterly, 7 (September, 1962), 236-257.
- Thompson, J. D. "Organizational Management of Conflict." Administrative Science Quarterly, 4 (1959-1960), 389-409.
- Thompson, V. A. "Bureaucracy and Innovation." Administrative Science Quarterly, 10 (1965-1966), 1-20.
- Triandis, Harry C. "Notes on the Design of Organizations." Approaches To Organizational Design. Edited by James D. Thompson. Pittsburg: University of Pittsburg Press, 1966.
- Udy, Stanley H., Jr. "The Comparative Analysis of Organizations." Handbook of Organizations. Edited by James G. March. Chicago: Rand McNalley and Company, 1965.
- Vroom, Victor H. "Some Personality Determinants of the Effects of Participation." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 59 (1959), 322-327.
- Walker, Charles R., and Guest, Robert H. "The Man on the Assembly Line." Organizations and Human Behavior: A Book of Readings. Edited by Gerald D. Bell. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967.
- Whyte, William F. "Parsons' Theory Applied to Organizations." The Social Theories of Talcott Parsons: A Critical Examination. Edited by Max Black. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1961.
- Williams, Robin M., Jr. "The Sociological Theory of Talcott Parsons." The Social Theories of Talcott Parsons: A Critical Examination. Edited by Max Black. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1961.
- Wilson, James Q. "Innovation in Organizations: Notes Toward a Theory." Approaches To Organizational Design. Edited by James D. Thompson. Pittsburg: University of Pittsburg Press, 1966.

MISCELLANEOUS

Greiner, L. E. "Organizational Change and Development." Unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation, Harvard University, 1965.

Hepburn, Kenneth T. "Management By Objectives: A Behavioral Perspective." Unpublished M.B.A. Dissertation, University of Alberta, 1968.

Hickson, D. J.; Pugh, D. S.; and Pheysey, D. C. "The Impact of Technology on Organizations." Unpublished Lecture Notes, Edmonton, Alberta, University of Alberta, Faculty of Business Administration and Commerce, March, 1969.

Nobbs, Richard Albert. "Canadian Values and Organizational Behavior." Unpublished M.B.A. Thesis, University of Alberta, 1967.

Shihadeh, Emile S. "Organizational Change." Unpublished Lecture Notes, Edmonton, Alberta, University of Alberta, Faculty of Business Administration and Commerce, March, 1969.

B29917